United Nations A/67/PV.27

General Assembly

Official Records

Sixty-seventh session

27th plenary meeting
Thursday, 18 October 2012, 10 a.m.
New York

President: Mr. Jeremić ..... (Serbia)

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

Agenda item 109

Elections to fill vacancies in principal organs

(a) Election of five non-permanent members of the Security Council

The President: The General Assembly will now proceed to the election of five non-permanent members of the Security Council to replace those members whose term of office expires on 31 December 2012.

The five outgoing non-permanent members are the following: Colombia, Germany, India, Portugal and South Africa. Those five States cannot be re-elected. Their names, therefore, should not appear on the ballot papers.

Apart from the five permanent members, the Security Council will include in the year 2013 the following States: Azerbaijan, Guatemala, Pakistan, Morocco and Togo. The names of those States, therefore, should also not appear on the ballot papers.

Of the five non-permanent members that will remain in office in the year 2013, three are from Africa and Asia-Pacific, one is from Eastern Europe and one is from Latin America and the Caribbean. Consequently, pursuant to paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 1991 A (XVIII), of 17 December 1963, the five non-permanent members should be elected according to the following pattern: two from Africa and Asia-Pacific, one from Latin American and the Caribbean, and two from Western Europe and other States. The ballot papers reflect that pattern.

In accordance with established practice, there is an understanding to the effect that, of the two States to be elected from Africa and Asia-Pacific, one should be from Africa and one from Asia-Pacific.

I should like to inform the Assembly that those candidates — their number not exceeding the number of seats to be filled — receiving the greatest number of votes and a two-thirds majority of those present and voting will be declared elected. If the number of candidates obtaining a two-thirds majority is less than the number of members to be elected, there shall be additional ballots to fill the remaining places, the voting being restricted to the candidates obtaining the greatest number of votes in the previous ballot to a number not more than twice the seats remaining to be filled.

Also, consistent with past practice, in case a tie vote should make it necessary to determine the candidate to be elected or that will proceed to the next round of restricted balloting, there will be a special restricted ballot limited to those candidates that have obtained an equal number of votes.

May I take it that the General Assembly agrees to these procedures?

It was so decided.

The President: In accordance with rule 92 of the rules of procedure, the election shall be held by secret ballot and there shall be no nominations.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

12-55501 (E)

Please recycle

Regarding candidatures, I have been informed by the Chairpersons of the respective regional groups of the following. For the two vacant seats from among the African and Asia-Pacific States, four candidates have been designated, namely, Bhutan, Cambodia, the Republic of Korea and Rwanda. For the one vacant seat from among the Latin American and Caribbean States, there is one endorsed candidate, namely, Argentina. For the two vacant seats fromm among the Western European and other States, there are three candidates, namely, Australia, Finland and Luxembourg.

In accordance with rule 92 of the rules of procedure, we shall now proceed to the election by secret ballot.

I now give the floor to the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo on a point of order.

Mrs. Malenga (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*spoke in French*): My delegation is speaking on a point of order to recall that the Charter of the United Nations confers on the Security Council the principal responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. In that regard, the States that are to have seats in the Council should be peace- and justice-loving countries.

Beyond its destabilizing role in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda today is a haven of tranquillity for all war criminals operating in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and who are wanted by the international justice system. As such, my delegation objects to Rwanda being elected to the Security Council as a non-permanent member.

The President: I take note of that statement, and I would like to remind the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo that, pursuant to rule 88 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order on the actual conduct of the voting.

We shall now begin the voting process. Members are requested to remain seated until all ballots have been collected.

Ballot papers marked "A", "B" and "C" will now be distributed. I request representatives to use only those ballot papers that have been distributed.

May I ask representatives to write on the ballot papers marked "A", for the African and Asia-Pacific States, the names of the two States for which they wish to vote; on the ballot papers marked "B", for the Latin American and Caribbean States, the name of the one State for which they wish to vote; and on the ballot papers marked "C", for the Western European and other States, the name of the two States for which they wish to vote.

A ballot will be declared invalid if it contains more names of Member States from the relevant region than the number of seats assigned to it. A ballot will also be declared invalid if all the names of the Member States on that ballot do not belong to the relevant region. If a ballot paper of a region includes both the names of Member States that belong to and that do not belong to that region, the ballot remains valid, but only the names of the Member States that belong to the relevant region will be counted. The names of Member States that do not belong to that region will not be counted.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Cabezas (Chile), Ms. Shiolashvili (Georgia), Mr. Volkwein (Germany), Mrs. Djan (Ghana), Mr. Tadome (Japan) and Ms. Lindqvist (Sweden) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

The meeting was suspended at 10.45 a.m. and resumed at 12.10 p.m.

The President: The result of the voting is as follows:

Group A — African and Asian-Pacific States

Number of ballot papers:	193
Number of invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	192
Abstentions:	1
Number of members voting:	192
Required two-thirds majority:	128
Number of votes obtained:	
Rwanda	148
Republic of Korea	116
Cambodia	62
Bhutan	20
United Republic of Tanzania	3
Democratic Republic of the Congo	1

Group B — Latin American and Caribbean States

Number of ballot papers:	193
Number of invalid ballots:	1
Number of valid ballots:	192
Abstentions:	8
Number of members voting:	184
Required two-thirds majority:	123

Number of votes obtained:	
Argentina	182
Barbados	1
Cuba	1

Group C — Western European and Other States

Number of ballot papers:	193
Number of invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	193
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	193
Required two-thirds majority:	129
Number of votes obtained:	
Australia	140
Luxembourg	128
Finland	108

Having obtained the required two-thirds majority and the largest number of votes, the following States were elected members of the Security Council for a two-year term beginning on 1 January 2013: Argentina, Australia and Rwanda.

The President: There remain two seats to be filled, one from among the African and Asian-Pacific States and one from among the Western European and other States. In accordance with established practice, there is an understanding to the effect that, of the two seats allocated to the African and Asian-Pacific States, one should be filled by an African State and one by an Asia-Pacific State. As Rwanda has already been elected, the remaining seat from among the African and Asian-Pacific States should be filled by an Asian-Pacific State. We shall therefore proceed to the first restricted ballot.

The second round of balloting shall be restricted to those two States from among the African and Asian-Pacific States that were not elected but obtained the largest number of votes in the previous ballot, namely, Cambodia and the Republic of Korea, and those two States from among the Western European and other States that were not elected but obtained the largest number of votes in the previous ballot, namely, Finland and Luxembourg. This is in accordance with rule 94 of the rules of procedure.

Before we begin the voting process, I should like to remind members that, pursuant to rule 88 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order on the actual conduct of the voting.

We shall now begin the voting process.

Ballot papers marked "A" and "B" will now be distributed. May I ask representatives to write on the ballot papers the names of the States for which they wish to vote. Ballot papers marked "A" for the African and Asia-Pacific States will be declared invalid if they contain the name of a State other than Cambodia or the Republic of Korea, as well as if they contain the name of more than one State. Ballot papers marked "B" for the Western European and other States will be declared invalid if they contain the name of a State other than Finland or Luxembourg, as well as if they contain the name of more than one State.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Cabezas (Chile), Ms. Shiolashvili (Georgia), Mr. Volkwein (Germany), Mrs. Djan (Ghana), Mr. Tadome (Japan) and Ms. Lindqvist (Sweden) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

The meeting was suspended at 12.25 a.m. and resumed at 1.05 p.m.

The President: The result of the voting is as follows:

Group A — African and Asian-Pacific States

Number of ballot papers:	193
Number of invalid ballots:	1
Number of valid ballots:	192
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	192
Required two-thirds majority:	128
Number of votes obtained:	
Republic of Korea	149
Cambodia	43

Group C — Western European and other States

Number of ballot papers:	193
Number of invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	193
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	193
Required two-thirds majority:	129
Number of votes obtained:	
Luxembourg	131
Finland	62

Having obtained the required two-thirds majority, Luxembourg and the Republic of Korea were elected members of the Security Council for a two-year term beginning 1 January 2013.

The President: The following five States have thus been elected members of the Security Council for a mandate of two years, beginning on 1 January 2013: Argentina, Australia, Luxembourg, the Republic of Korea and Rwanda.

I congratulate the States that have been elected members of the Security Council, and I thank the tellers for their assistance in this election.

The General Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of sub-item (a) of agenda item 109.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

United Nations A/67/PV.28

General Assembly

Sixty-seventh session

Official Records

28th plenary meeting
Monday, 22 October 2012, 3 p.m.
New York

President: Mr. Jeremić ..... (Serbia)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda items 9 and 14

Report of the Economic and Social Council

Report of the Economic and Social Council (A/67/3)

Note by the Secretary-General (A/67/298)

Integrated and coordinated implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social and related fields

Notes by the Secretary-General (A/67/82 and A/67/270)

The President: In connection with agenda item 9, I would like to recall for members that, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 58/316, of 1 July 2004, the Assembly, on the recommendation of the General Committee, decided at its 2nd plenary meeting, on 21 September 2012, to consider agenda item 9 in its entirety in plenary, on the understanding that the administrative, programme and budgetary aspects should be dealt with by the Fifth Committee.

At the same meeting, the Assembly took note of the clarification that, in implementing resolution 58/316 to consider item 9 in its entirety in plenary, the relevant parts of chapter I of the report that are under agenda items already allocated to the Main Committees will be considered by the Committee concerned for final action by the General Assembly.

In connection with agenda item 14, members will recall that, pursuant to resolution 57/270 B, the Assembly decided to consider the item the chapters of the annual report of the Economic and Social Council relevant to the integrated and coordinated implementation of the major United Nations conferences and summits, including through the participation in its discussions of the President of the Council.

I am grateful for the opportunity to give the opening remarks before the presentation of the report of the Economic and Social Council for 2012 (A/67/3). The General Assembly and the Council have a long-standing tradition of cooperation, and I look forward to strengthening that valuable relationship throughout the sixty-seventh session. My Office and the Council's Bureau have intensified their contacts over the past month with the aim of improving coordination and the overall effectiveness of our work. President Koterec and I have discussed a number of issues of common interest, including how to strengthen our shared approach to the sustainable development agenda and to promoting a more inclusive global economy.

In my address to the Economic and Social Council special ministerial meeting, one of the questions I raised was how to fortify multilateral responses to development challenges. I welcomed the Council's commitment to playing a more pronounced role in the post-2015 discussions, in the light of the mandate it received from world leaders gathered in Rio in June. The statement issued at the end of the Ministerial Meeting reaffirmed that a more sustainable development model can be achieved only through a broad alliance

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

12-56130 (E)

Please recycle

of peoples, Governments, civil society and the private sector. That view is in line with the message of the "The future we want", the outcome document (resolution 66/288, annex) of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20).

I believe that we should also encourage enhanced participation in our efforts by the world's public policy institutes and think-tanks. I hope that we can work together to find ways to draw on their tremendous capabilities more effectively so that we can benefit from their wisdom and experience more than has been the case in the past.

A mandate was given to the General Assembly to establish an intergovernmental process to propose options for an effective financing strategy to advance the Rio+20 agenda. We were also given the responsibility of preparing a high-level forum, to be launched at the beginning of next session. In addition, the General Assembly was tasked with establishing a working group to propose a list of sustainable development goals for consideration and adoption by the plenary. The Secretary-General's High-level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda is another significant part of this process, as is the role of the Economic and Social Council, in accordance with paragraphs 82 and 83 of the Rio+20 concluding document.

Let me underline the critical importance of enhancing coordination between the Secretariat, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly at this session. We need to ensure that our work is mutually reinforcing and complementary, and that we avoid any duplication of effort. Here, I would like to mention Africa in particular. I deeply believe that we must better address its special needs in the time ahead so that we can bridge the gap effectively between that continent's promise and the reality on the ground. I believe that the United Nations should truly prioritize supporting African nations in unlocking their full potential.

As I underlined in my address to last month's Economic and Social Council ministerial meeting, I am of the opinion that the General Assembly should play a more pronounced role in the ongoing debate on global economic governance. Let me be very clear that the intent is not to infringe on existing prerogatives but to complement existing efforts, in order to help answer a number of questions related to transparency, inclusiveness and legitimacy.

To that end, I would like to bring three mutually reinforcing initiatives to members' attention. The first is the participation of the Economic and Social Council in helping to organize an informal high-level debate in the General Assembly on the United Nations in world economic governance, in accordance with resolution 66/256. I will continue to consult with the Member States and President Koterec on the matter and expect to reach a common position on how to proceed in the near future.

As President, I signal my intention to build closer and more formalized relations with international financial institutions, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, as well as with the Group of Twenty (G-20). That constitutes a second aspect of the approach I believe we should take. I would welcome the involvement of the Economic and Social Council in this endeavour, to be coordinated with the General Assembly. Senior representatives from the G-20 will continue to brief the Assembly, as has been the custom in previous years.

In my view, we could all benefit from regularizing those interactions. That is why I have proposed to launch a process leading to the establishment of an effective consultative framework between the General Assembly and various intergovernmental financial institutions and informal groupings, with a focus on the G-20.

A third aspect involves holding debates and conferences on global economic issues under the auspices of the Assembly ahead of the G-20 Summit in Saint Petersburg next year. In that context, I am pleased to welcome the idea of the Government of Kazakhstan to coordinate the agenda of the May 2013 Astana Economic Forum with related efforts here in the United Nations. That annual gathering of distinguished economists and some of the world's most innovative and influential minds from the private sector, think-tanks and civil society is an important platform for exchanging views, experiences and best practices on major economic, financial and social development issues.

I believe that a more dynamic Economic and Social Council can make an even stronger contribution to the work of the General Assembly. The report before us today serves as an important reference point in the process. In accordance with resolution 61/16, I will shortly announce the appointment of co-facilitators to lead consultations on how to further strengthen the Council. In my view, the task is of the utmost importance

for the General Assembly, especially given the mandate we share with Economic and Social Council and the Secretariat to follow up on the outcomes of Rio+20, as well as our common responsibilities to set the post-2015 agenda.

I believe that the Assembly and the Council can become central pillars in ongoing multilateral cooperation efforts in the related fields of sustainable development and global economic governance, in keeping with the terms of Chapter IX of the Charter of the United Nations. By working more closely together, we can help further promote the role of the United Nations in setting the world on a more secure, equitable and prosperous path.

I give the floor to the Vice-President of the Economic and Social Council, His Excellency Mr. Luis-Alfonso de Alba, to introduce the report of the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. De Alba (Mexico), Vice-President of the Economic and Social Council (*spoke in Spanish*): Allow me to thank you, Sir, for your introductory remarks to our debate on the agenda item before us. Your words, in particular your readiness to cooperate very closely with the Economic and Social Council, are without doubt very welcome. All members of the Economic and Social Council consider it to be essential, as you said, that we work together and pool our efforts, especially in developing the mandates with which we have been entrusted by meetings recently held, particularly that of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20). You may rest assured that all members of the Economic and Social Council and the Bureau will work as closely as possible with you.

The report that I have submitted for 2012 (A/67/3) reveals a year of productive work and a wide range of activities. At the same time, it has also been a year of preparation for tackling new challenges under the able leadership of Ambassador Koterec of Slovakia. I would like on this occasion simply to draw attention to some of the most prominent aspects of our work during the period.

First, I would recall that, as the principal organ of the United Nations responsible for development matters, the Economic and Social Council has served as a platform in 2012 for over 40 ministers, high-level political policymakers, eminent academics, leading businessmen and members of civil society to share views and know-how regarding opportunities for job creation for all. In association with the International Labour Organization and the United Nations system in general, the Economic and Social Council has advocated an integrated, results-based approach to addressing the employment crisis. Specifically, it has recommended that collective endeavours focus on productive employment, on jobs in the green economy, particularly for young people, and on social protection. Those recommendations were set down in a comprehensive ministerial declaration, emphasizing also the need for collective measures to be immediately put into effect to boost productivity and generate quality jobs for the unemployed and underemployed throughout the world.

As in previous years, ministerial considerations were based on a consultative process. National and regional views of problems related to employment were folded into the general consideration of the job crisis at the world level. Through preparatory meetings in Africa, the Asia-Pacific region and Latin America and the Caribbean, consultations were held with key regional actors on matters ranging from productivity to small and medium-sized enterprises, as well as inclusive growth. The consultations were a major platform for the exchange of best practices and regional experiences.

In addition, eight countries made voluntary national presentations to inform the Council on the progress achieved towards their national development objectives and on continuing difficulties in achieving their employment-related objectives and aims.

In the series of high-level meetings held, the 2012 Development Cooperation Forum enjoyed unprecedented levels of participation and interest. Indeed, the Forum, which has met on only three occasions, has already consolidated its position as a critical space for dialogue on policies and technical guidance regarding development. Recent appeals to make cooperation for development more inclusive will no doubt ensure a greater role and prominence for work of this nature.

In the series of coordination meetings, consideration was given to the follow-up by the United Nations system to the Economic and Social Council ministerial declaration of 2011 on education. Particular emphasis was placed on the collaborative association of United Nations bodies, civil society and the private sector. An in-depth consideration also took place on the matter of the disconnect between knowledge and aptitudes, on

the one hand, and the needs of the labour market, on the other.

In the Council's coordination meetings, consideration was also given to the follow-up process for the Monterrey Consensus and the Doha Conference on Financing for Development. It was agreed to avoid overlap between this process and the outcomes of Rio+20 in terms of financing for development. Likewise, a special meeting was held on innovative mechanisms of development financing. That meeting concluded by highlighting the need to consolidate global endeavours through special funds that could extend existing initiatives and introduce new, innovative mechanisms, such as green vouchers, without duplicating efforts.

During the series of meetings on operational activities, preparations were completed for the Assembly's quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system. In this regard, consideration was given to the following matters, among others: assessment of the funding of the United Nations system; the establishment of better instruments to enhance coherence; the strengthening of the resident coordinator system; and the enhancement of the efficacy of entrepreneurial activities. This has given rise to a very solid analytical foundation on which to base efforts to ensure that the work of the Assembly during the current session can be pursued in the most substantive manner possible.

The series of meetings on humanitarian matters focused, as in earlier years, on the most complex emergencies occurring around the world and on solutions to improve responses to future crises. As we all remember, that series of meetings this year was notable for its emphasis on the transition from aid to development, particularly in addressing the challenges of the Sahel region. Many participants drew attention to the need to maintain the flow of international aid at a level above and beyond what is needed in terms of an immediate response in that region. Specifically, development assistance in the region must encourage growth and promote stability and shared prosperity for all.

In the series of general meetings, the Council adopted measures with respect to a very wide range of issues on the basis of reports prepared by the functional and regional commissions, non-governmental organizations, the Committee of Experts on International Cooperation in Tax Matters, and various specialized bodies and experts. Allow me to briefly draw attention to three concrete outcomes of that series of meetings.

First, a new plan of action was adopted to ensure that the entire system can make progress on gender equality and the advancement of women.

With respect to the least developed countries, the Council paved the way for follow-up to the Istanbul Programme of Action and supported the inclusion of the Republic of South Sudan on the list of least developed countries and the removal of Vanuatu from that same list. The Council urgently appeals to the General Assembly to promptly adopt measures with respect to these recommendations.

In addition, particular attention was given to aid effectiveness and policy coherence in South Sudan and Haiti, emphasizing efforts to ensure commitment, transparency and accountability among those involved in the development of those countries. At the same time, the Council focused on strengthening its own collaborative relationships, recognizing an additional 286 non-governmental organizations as consultative entities.

The Economic and Social Council must continue to build on the foundations of its 2012 achievements, taking into account the challenges inherent in sustainable development, including the integration of the three principal pillars of sustainable development. The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development re-emphasized the mandate of the Economic and Social Council as one of the principal organs responsible for the integrated and coordinated follow-up of the outcomes of all United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social, environmental and associated fields. It also recognized — and I think this is particularly important — that the Council has made a decisive contribution to the integration of the three pillars of sustainable development in a balanced fashion. As you stated, Sir, this must be further pursued by the Assembly.

This renewed and strengthened mandate requires the Economic and Social Council to build its capacity to successfully integrate the social, environmental and economic agendas and to convene all relevant actors. It has therefore requested the Secretary-General — and, through him, Member States and other relevant actors — to submit proposals on its strengthening, particularly of its methods of work.

Lastly, allow me to state that the Bureau of the Economic and Social Council welcomes the unfailing cooperation of Governments and other associated actors within the United Nations system that support these reform processes and who await concrete proposals, having repeatedly affirmed their readiness to immediately undertake significant efforts for a comprehensive reform and the construction of the future we all want.

The President: I give the floor to the observer of the European Union.

Mr. Beviglia Zampetti (European Union): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The acceding country Croatia; the candidate countries the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia; the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Georgia align themselves with this declaration.

We would like to thank the Vice-President of the Economic and Social Council for introducing the Council's report (A/67/3). We would also like to acknowledge with gratitude the support provided by the Secretariat to the Council this year. The European Union and its member States commend the work of the Council during the reporting period and recognize the committed leadership of its President, Mr. Miloš Koterec of Slovakia, and of the Bureau.

In the next few weeks and months, we will be actively engaged in the review of resolution 61/16 on the strengthening of the Economic and Social Council. In that regard, this statement will focus on three points. First, the EU is encouraged by the progress in the revitalization of the Council. The Development Cooperation Forum and the annual ministerial review, for example, have become important elements of the Council's substantive session. Secondly, while we primarily need to build upon that progress, there is room for improvement in many areas in order to make the Council more effective and efficient in its working methods. Thirdly, the relevance of the Council ultimately depends on our own willingness to make it work.

The EU and its member States would like to acknowledge the comprehensive preparations carried out for the substantive session of the Council, including through the organization of events such as the joint meeting with the Peacebuilding Commission and the dialogue with youth representatives on jobs held during the year. We equally welcome the work on employment undertaken by the Council at its current session. We appreciate the role of the Council in fostering dialogue and helping to forge converging views and a coherent policy vision on the follow-up to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development and, in particular, the contribution of the Development Cooperation Forum to promoting the broader post-2015 development agenda, especially on issues related to development effectiveness, mutual accountability and development-oriented partnerships.

The Economic and Social Council is an important and, in some respects, essential institutional home for our debates and deliberations. It provides us with a useful mechanism for oversight and coordination of the crucial United Nations work in the economic, social and environmental fields, including its operational activities for development. The Council also has a strong mandate to contribute to improved coherence and coordination and a balanced integration of the three dimensions of sustainable development and of the long-term perspective regarding policymaking. We should collectively commit to following up on these efforts over time.

However, there is always room for improvement. The Economic and Social Council can build on its convening power at the international level on global challenges, trends and emerging issues. The Council has a unique position as the main body for system-wide coordination and for the follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social, environmental and related fields. The Council should strive to ensure better coherence in the way the system of subsidiary bodies, funds and programmes is able to respond to the mandates emanating from those outcomes. It should ensure a coherent policy vision for the Rio+20 follow-up and the broader post-2015 development agenda, contributing to convergence and coordination and avoiding the overlapping and duplication of processes.

Moreover, the multi-stakeholder nature of the Economic and Social Council is one of its most important features and something we should capitalize on. The Council has to be a window to realities outside the halls of the United Nations. The further strengthening of the Council's interactions with all stakeholders will

certainly improve public perception not only of that body, but also of the United Nations as a whole, and increase its ability to play a relevant role in global affairs. The implementation of sustainable development is a multi-stakeholder exercise that the Council should also better reflect in its working methods.

Ultimately, as we endeavour to review the implementation of relevant provisions related to the revitalization of the Council, it is our firm belief that the Council will be as strong and as relevant as we want it to be. As one participant stated during the special ministerial meeting of the Council in September, "we get the ECOSOC we deserve". The EU and its member States stand ready to actively participate, together with all our partners, in the reflection on how to further improve the Economic and Social Council's effectiveness.

Mr. Pisarevich (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): We thank you, Mr. President, for your introductory remarks and the Vice-President of the Economic and Social Council for his comprehensive introduction of the report of the Council (A/67/3).

Belarus commends the activities of the Economic and Social Council and notes the innovative approaches in its work. The Council remains the key policy platform at the global level for crafting strategies for collective action in the area of global development. The Development Cooperation Forum reaffirmed that fact. That event made it possible to undertake an analysis of current trends in international cooperation in the context of the outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20).

We view the Council as the coordinator for practical implementation of the decisions of the Rio Conference in order to reach a global transition to sustainable development. We must not let the consensus achieved in Brazil be buried by endless argument over procedural issues. After all, that in principle would delay substantive discussion by the international community on problematic issues and the formulation of the post-2015 agenda.

We believe that the Council's efforts at macroeconomic coordination seek to ensure sustainable and balanced growth of the world economy. The Council must act to ensure full compliance with the principles of free and fair trade, which preclude the use of various protectionist measures and unilateral economic sanctions. Furthermore, the Council must work to ensure that the implementation of the concepts of sustainable development and the green economy do not aggravate the existing development gap between developing and developed countries, strengthen the technological dependency of developing countries on developed countries, reduce a country's national capacity for choosing the most effective strategies for sustainable development, or create new dividing lines or barriers.

The work of the Council's 2012 substantive session reaffirmed the efforts of Member States to continue to rely on the mechanisms of the United Nations in order to address pressing social and economic challenges. We welcome the new forms of work that were undertaken at the session. Specifically, we note the dialogue of member States with the management of the primary operational funds and programmes on the issue of preparing for a quadrennial review of the operational activities of the United Nations with the presidents of the regional commissions of the United Nations on programme activities, and on the holding of side events on issues that are important for member States.

The holding of thematic events on medium-income countries and on assistance to talented youth have given additional impetus to discussing the forms of, and prospects for, cooperation in those areas between the members and the agencies of the United Nations system. We support the continuing practice of holding high-level meetings of the Council by inviting the leaders of the Bretton Woods institutions, the World Trade Organization and the International Labour Organization on the most pressing problems of the global economy and finances. Accordingly, we expect that those discussions, taking place in the context of a high degree of global economic and financial instability, will be aimed at crystallizing practical steps to ensure sustainable economic development.

We look forward to the proposals of the Secretary-General on strengthening the Council and improving its working methods in the light of the views of its Members.

We call on all interested States Members of the United Nations to contribute to strengthening the Economic and Social Council. We cannot allow the reform of the Council to be turned into an endless renovation that one can only suspend but never bring to a successful conclusion. Today's realities leave no time for such an experiment. We all need a strong Economic and Social Council right now.

Ms. Prince (United States of America): The United States values the Economic and Social Council as an essential platform for exchanging ideas, learning from one another's national experiences and sharpening our collective thinking about a next-generation global development agenda. Strengthening the Council has been a long-standing item on our shared agenda. In the run-up to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20), we began a renewed conversation about our multilateral institutions and how we can better adapt them to meet the challenges and opportunities before us as a global community.

The global development landscape is changing dramatically. New drivers of wealth coexist with chronic impediments to prosperity. By 2030, the world population will grow to 8.3 billion people, who will rightly have rising expectations for their future and who will make increasing demands on our world's resources. A growing youth demographic will coexist with the increasing age of most countries' populations. Urbanization will accelerate, and new technologies will continue to create opportunities for innovation and action.

Our international architecture for development will have to evolve apace. It will need to become more responsive to twenty-first-century development dynamics and what drives development decisions and outcomes, including by better mobilizing and targeting existing multilateral expertise, resources and capacities. It will need to explore ways to reconcile the United Nations system's diverse authorities with greater incentives for coherence. It will also need renewed commitment to evidence-based decision-making, as well as monitoring and evaluation that are responsive to the results that we are trying to achieve. Moreover, it will finally need a degree of flexibility, especially because we are just at the beginning of our deliberations on elaborating a post-2015 development agenda.

The Economic and Social Council has essential tools and should be a central venue for examining those issues. Its thematic breadth and responsibility for policy deliberation, coordination and oversight make it an important forum for a new approach that emphasizes convergence, value added and results. For example, a key issue such as women's roles and sustainable rural development could be established as a thread that runs through all parts of the Council's system, from the spring meetings of the Bretton Woods institutions to the Commission on the Status of Women and the Commission on Science and Technology.

We know that we must cooperate in new ways that span the existing development architecture and bridge institutional barriers. That includes partnerships with the private sector, other multilateral entities and non-governmental organizations, as well as civil society and local actors.

Overall, the Economic and Social Council and its functional commissions and other subsidiary bodies can provide a practical forum for integrated policy debate and support. That will require strengthened working methods, more responsive agenda-setting and a commitment to ongoing innovation. The high-level political forum agreed at Rio can also build on the strengths of the Economic and Social Council system. Overall, we need to modernize institutional arrangements to be focused, serious, credible and responsive to citizens and leaders alike. Above all, we need to deliver results to people around the world who rightly are demanding them.

Finally, the United States would like to take this opportunity to express its appreciation for the granting of the United Nations Population Award earlier this year to a pioneering advocate for reproductive health, Ms. Adrienne Germain. Ms. Germain has been in the forefront of the field of women's rights and family planning since the 1970s. She was a member of the United States delegations to the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995 and the International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo in 1994, and has served as a civil society adviser in recent years to the United States delegation to the United Nations Commission on Population and Development. She is well known to our Mission and others in New York, and we are gratified that the contributions of this prominent American in this important field have been acknowledged with this award.

Mr. O'Brien (India): I am privileged to address the General Assembly. I bring greetings from India. We are in the midst of our biggest festival of the year in Bengal, the state of India where I live, and on behalf of the people of India and the people of Bengal, I would like to wish everyone here in the Hall a happy and prosperous Durga Puja.

At the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) in June this year, the global community made a solemn promise to craft a future that

would truly and really — and not just in some clichéd way — belong to all, to each one of us, to every child of Mother Earth. It was a promise to the marginalized to deliver a life of dignity, a life of hope. It was a pledge to fight poverty as the greatest global challenge.

With just three years to go to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) finish line, where do we stand? The task at hand remains a daunting one. More than a billion people in developing countries continue to live in extreme poverty, hunger and hopeless desperation. We need to do much more. About the MDGs, we can take some comfort in collectively having made progress on poverty eradication, primary education, gender equality and sanitation. However, when we introspect, our record on maternal mortality, infant mortality and malnutrition remains a matter of deep and abiding concern.

We will have a planet that is more populous in the twenty-first century than ever before in human history. Yet, are we doing enough to harness that demographic dividend? In India, we have pursued the path of inclusive growth for achieving poverty eradication. We have in fact brought down poverty numbers significantly as compared with the 1990 levels, but we continue to be challenged by more than 300 million people living below the poverty line of $1.25 a day. That number, 300 million people, is about equivalent to the population of the United States, which should emphasize the enormity of the crisis and the moral obligation that still confronts us.

In primary education, India has achieved a near 100 per cent enrolment. In part, that has been a result of our Right to Education Act, which makes eight years of schooling a legal right that the Indian State must ensure to every citizen. The challenge now is to focus on the quality of learning in our schools and to further narrow the gender gap in secondary and primary schooling. Over the past decade, we have for the first time in our history added more female literates than males, an achievement that we are justifiably proud of.

However, India is conscious of the health and social development gaps that have yet to be addressed. Our commitment to tackling infant and maternal mortality and augmenting women's empowerment remains absolute and unflinching. In fact, it is part of our nation-building tradition. As Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar, one of the foremost minds of nineteenth-century Bengal, a pioneer of modern India and a champion of gender rights, female emancipation and girls' education, wrote:

> "How sad! The country whose male population is unkind, unreligious and unaware of the distinction between the good and the evil, and does not care about justice and fairness, and where abiding the rituals is the chief preoccupation of religion, should not give birth to girls!"

That philosophy, which Vidyasagar explained in the 1850s, 150 years ago, anticipated the enlightenment of the MDGs. The MDGs represent the most cherished chapter of multilateralism. At Rio+20, we discussed practically every aspect of human endeavour and came up with a blueprint for action on sustainable development that rightfully integrates economic growth with social inclusion and environmental sustainability.

As we sit down to fashion the sustainable development goals, we must do so with a clear idea that they would form the crux of the post-2015 development agenda. Dealing with challenges related to poverty, food, energy and livelihood issues should be our priority. The MDG framework has given us valuable lessons as to what works and what does not work. There is little value in trying to reinvent the wheel. The framework of MDG goals should be replicated in the new set of goals.

Our commitment to the MDGs and to Rio+20 is unwavering, but the global economic situation does not seem to favour us. Slackened growth, high inflation — particularly food inflation — a mounting debt burden and high youth unemployment are undercutting the development gains made in developing countries. It is therefore of fundamental importance that we, as a global community, be able to put the world economy back on track. Nothing can be more helpful as we do our best to put more resources into and bring greater focus onto our development goals.

We must also redouble our efforts to push for urgent progress on the Doha Development Round. Those who profess that more trade and not aid is the answer to the development gaps of our era need to put their words into action. Shibboleths alone cannot do it. It is equally imperative to fashion a comprehensive and balanced outcome to climate-change negotiations, based on the principles of common but differentiated responsibility and equity.

South-South cooperation must also contribute, and it must be allowed to grow within its own space

and its own ecosystem and in accordance with its own principles. It cannot and must not be a substitute for North-South cooperation. The two processes are complementary and, as a world community, we have to avoid limiting ourselves to either-or choices.

An issue of crucial importance today for sustainable development is the deficit of global governance. Without addressing the issue of global governance, we cannot restructure the twenty-first century comity of nations as an equitable matrix that serves the cause of all. The decisions of the self-selected few can hardly provide the solutions we seek for the many. It is crucial, therefore, that developing countries be given due voice and participation in the decision-making structures of the global economic and financial institutions, especially the Bretton Woods institutions.

Here at the United Nations, it is critical that we move urgently on reform of the Security Council by expanding it in both categories, permanent and non-permanent, to revitalize the General Assembly and strengthen the Economic and Social Council.

The Convention on Biological Diversity, born out of the Earth Summit, remains a seminal global compact on development. This past week in India, we successfully concluded the Eleventh Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. We hope that its outcome will help us achieve our collective commitments. I wish to thank all participants for their support in making that event a success.

Mr. Charles (Trinidad and Tobago), Vice-President, took the Chair.

In the developing countries, feeding our people and providing them with sustenance is a challenge that we grapple with every day. We are hopeful that our biodiversity resources and conservation efforts will help us find new solutions to food security and livelihood issues.

Space scientists call our Earth the "Goldilocks planet" — not too hot, not too cold, just right for life. Indeed, in keeping with that imagery, humankind's evolution and prodigious attainments over the millennia that have passed have been nothing short of a fairy tale — a true miracle. True, our challenges are many, but given what we have achieved; given the diseases and scourges we have beaten back; and given the disasters and calamities we have learned to protect ourselves against, what we are left with is, frankly, only the last mile.

With our collaborative effort and collective will, we can do it. We can fashion a better world for ourselves, and as a legacy for our children and succeeding generations. Acting multilaterally, though institutions and agencies such as the United Nations, we represent hope for millions across the world. This is a hope that seeks only basic necessities of life. This is a hope we cannot betray.

As the great Bengali poet Rabindranath Tagore, the first Asian to win the Nobel Prize for literature, eloquently put it: "I slept and dreamt that life was joy. I awoke and saw that life was service. I acted and behold, service was joy." Let us, as a global community, awaken to service and to joy.

Mr. Alotaibi (Kuwait) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation is pleased to participate in discussing one of the most important items on the agenda of the General Assembly, as reflected in the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/67/3). At the outset, I would like to commend the contents of the report on the effective contributions and activities undertaken by the Economic and Social Council in the past session.

The suffocating financial crisis that the world has witnessed in recent years is still casting its shadow over the global economy. Abject poverty, increased unemployment and a host of other issues stand between many developing countries and their achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. All those challenges make us more determined than ever to support the work of the Economic and Social Council, develop its mechanisms and improve its competence as the supreme international organ concerned with achieving socioeconomic development, supporting the welfare of peoples and raising their standards of living. Given the fundamental role that the Council plays in fostering sustainable development, I would like to emphasize the importance of strengthening the partnership between it and the other principal organs of the United Nations, particularly the General Assembly.

The international community currently bears the huge responsibility of addressing socioeconomic challenges. It is therefore important to emphasize the need to translate the results of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development into a tangible reality, especially with regard to sustainable development, the environment, climate change and the integration of economic visions in a manner that will help United States to achieve the Millennium Development Goals.

Achieving the three pillars of sustainable development — economic, social and environmental — requires our countries to adopt comprehensive national policies to create a climate conducive to supporting those pillars and enacting appropriate legislation for their implementation. That investment in our countries' capabilities will enable us to foster common international economic cooperation in confronting the challenges of our times.

The State of Kuwait, based on its firm belief in the concept of international partnership, is helping developing countries to overcome the obstacles and difficulties they face by financing economic and development projects to improve their economies.

In recognition of the clear underpinnings of our foreign policy, which is based on fostering and strengthening relations among States in order to achieve an ideal model for international partnership, built upon mutual respect and common interests, the Kuwait Fund for Arab Economic Development has provided more than $18 billion in assistance over the past five decades in the form of grants, technical support and concessional loans to more than 100 developing and least developed countries to help them achieve sustainable development.

The State of Kuwait has continued to launch initiatives calling for the establishment of specialized funds covering different parts of the world in order to address economic, educational, environmental, health and development issues. It also contributes to resolving issues of unemployment, food security and other challenges faced by the peoples of developing countries. The latest such initiative was launched by His Highness Sheikh Sabah Al-Ahmad Al-Jaber Al-Sabah, Amir of the State of Kuwait, at the first summit of the Asia Cooperation Dialogue, hosted by the State of Kuwait from 15 to 17 October, to establish a fund to finance development projects in non-Arab Asian countries with $2 billion in capital. His Highness also announced that Kuwait will contribute $300 million to help the least developed countries in Asia achieve the Millennium Development Goals. In addition, His Highness announced Kuwait's readiness to join the Asian Development Bank, based on his interest in increasing Kuwait's cooperation with Asian countries.

The State of Kuwait attaches special importance to the activities of the Economic and Social Council and commits itself fully to the Council's decisions and policies, and to those of its subsidiary committees, to coordinate and strengthen economic cooperation with a view to advancing the development goals, in particular the eradication of poverty, combating serious and communicable diseases, and achieving sustainable development. Furthermore, the State of Kuwait has never spared any effort in supporting the work of international and regional institutions involved in the field of development to enable them to carry out their functions by providing them with all kinds of ongoing assistance and support to help developing countries and the least developed countries achieve the Millennium Development Goals.

Based on its belief in the important role of the Economic and Social Council, the State of Kuwait presented its candidature for membership of the Council for the term 2013-2015. The election is to be held on 31 October. We hope to receive the support and backing of Member States in order to enable us to proceed with our efforts in the economic, social and environmental fields through the international organ responsible for integrating and coordinating international activities in those fields.

Mr. Rahman (Bangladesh): Allow me to begin by thanking the Ambassador of Mexico, who in his capacity as Vice-President of the Council presented the report of the Council (A/67/3) on behalf of its President. We commend the work of the Council and the leadership of Ambassador Miloš Koterec in steering the proceedings of the Council during the reporting year.

Over the years, the Economic and Social Council has played an important role in advancing a concerted approach to the global development agenda. It strives to promote an integrated and coordinated implementation of the commitments made in the major United Nations conferences and summits. The two innovative functions entrusted to that body — namely, the holding of the annual ministerial review and the biennial Development Cooperation Forum — are considered to be useful in providing substantive inputs and thereby contributing to a more effective follow-up.

Through these mechanisms, the Council is able to assess national and international efforts to achieve the development goals. It is now possible for the Council to take a deeper look at all the cross-cutting areas of the outcomes of the major United Nations global events in economic and social areas. The focus of the most recent annual ministerial review — the eradication of poverty, which is one of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) — has indeed facilitated an in-depth analysis of the progress made and remaining challenges in

fighting that global scourge. It is timely as we approach the deadline for achieving the MDGs.

With all that good work being done, we still believe that there is room for further improvement in the functioning of the Economic and Social Council. We can and must work to make the Council the central United Nations organ for the coordination and supervision of development activities, as was originally envisaged by the United Nations Charter and subsequently strengthened by various United Nations resolutions, particularly resolution 61/16. In that regard, the recently held United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) provided considerable inputs which can help bring about the necessary reform of that organ.

The United Nations conferences and summits held since the 1990s have generated an extraordinary global awareness of the need to pursue sustained, inclusive and equitable development. It is a widely shared view that full and effective implementation of the outcomes of those events could significantly contribute towards achieving the cherished objective of prosperity for all.

As we engage in the annual review of the outcome and implementation of major global conferences, we need to take stock of the current situation, evaluate how much progress we have been able to achieve, and identify what more is required to implement them fully. While there has been progress in several areas, it is clear that a lot remains to be achieved. Certainly, there is a need for resolute action to move the development agenda forward. The global economic uncertainties should not become an excuse for inaction. The Economic and Social Council has an important role to play in that regard.

The ongoing global economic and financial challenges pose serious impediments to peace, security and development. Unemployment, volatile food and energy prices erode the policy space for developing countries in advancing economic development efforts. That has further undermined the limited capacity of the poorer countries to cope with external shocks and vulnerabilities.

It is now evident that many developing countries, particularly the least developed countries (LDCs), will not be able to meet MDG targets within the timeline. A key element for not being able to realize those minimum development aspirations is the gap in development financing. Official development assistance (ODA) remains an important source of development financing for the developing countries, especially for the LDCs. There is a need for enhanced and predictable official development assistance, aligned with the priorities of developing countries.

At the International Conference on Financing for Development, held in Monterrey, the global community agreed that our collective goal was to eradicate poverty, achieve sustained economic growth and promote sustainable development. The commitment made in Monterrey and reiterated in Doha needs to be fulfilled urgently. The ODA commitment of 0.7 per cent of gross national income must be met at the earliest possible date.

It is important that the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council look into the most appropriate modalities for follow-up to major conferences and summits, with a view to promoting coherent, coordinated and integrated United Nations actions in that regard. Poverty eradication must continue to be the foremost priority of the post-2015 global development agenda. At Rio+20, it was unequivocally recognized as the greatest global challenge. Our work on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review and sustainable development goals must be anchored in those imperatives. We should attach due importance to considering such issues as education, health care, employment and access to water and sanitation while drafting the sustainable development goals in the coming days. In fact, all the unmet MDGs should be subsumed within the future sustainable development goals.

Climate change is having a serious impact on many countries and even threatening their existence. Its impact is undermining the development efforts of many countries. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change could not assure us of robust and immediate actions on its decisions, including in the areas of adaptation and mitigation. It is high time that a global, comprehensive and ambitious agreement on climate change be reached, in line with and reflecting the Kyoto Protocol. The agreement should include not only provisions on greenhouse gas emissions, the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, and burden-sharing, but also the concerns of climate migrants, the transfer of green technologies, and provisions of the Green Climate Fund, among others, for adaptation and mitigation purposes. We must

also push for an early implementation of the Cancún Agreements.

We all know that international trade is a critical engine of development, especially for developing countries that are dependent on exports. Undoubtedly, lack of market access, Aid for Trade and the absence of a multilateral rules-based trading system continue to deny a level playing field for all and to affect the trade prospects of developing countries.

If we wish to make trade truly an engine of inclusive growth, it is essential to restart the stalled Doha Development Round and bring it to a conclusion at the earliest possible date. The Round must comprehensively address trade-distorting factors, including agricultural subsidies in developed countries. Duty-free and quota-free market access and support for the productive capacity-building of LDCs should be pursued expeditiously and comprehensively. Developed and developing countries in a position to do so must provide duty-free and quota-free facilities to all products from all LDCs. This can and should be done even before the conclusion of the Doha Round, under the "early harvest" measures of the World Trade Organization.

We cannot overemphasize the need to have a coordinated, inclusive, equitable and transparent follow-up to all these global aspirations, as reflected in the outcomes of global conferences and summits.

Mr. Haniff (Malaysia): On behalf of my delegation, I wish to thank the President for holding this joint debate. I also would like to express our appreciation for the documents submitted under this agenda item (A/67/3, A/67/298 and A/67/82).

The ongoing global financial and economic crisis has reversed much of the world's economic growth and badly affected much-needed development, particularly in the developing countries. This crisis has threatened the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015.

Against this backdrop, at the national level, Malaysia has adopted forward-looking macroeconomic policies through the tenth Malaysia Plan, aimed at delivering high economic growth in a sustained, inclusive and equitable manner and ensuring that Malaysia is on track to become a high-income nation by 2020. At the global level, Malaysia will continue to share its knowledge and experience in economic and social development with other countries, especially the least developed countries, through capacity-building initiatives conducted through the Malaysian Technical Cooperation Programme and through other similar initiatives undertaken in conjunction with development partners, including the United Nations.

Malaysia is grateful for and elated by the selection of the Federation of Reproductive Health Associations of Malaysia as the recipient for the 2012 United Nations Population Award in the institutional category, in recognition of the Federation's outstanding achievements in advocating reproductive health and advancing the health and status of women and children in Malaysia.The Federation has played an important role in bringing visibility to family planning not only in Malaysia but also in other parts of Asia. It has also demonstrated a high level of commitment to improving the lives of disadvantaged communities, including refugees, sex workers, and transsexual and marginalized youth in juvenile homes and orphanages. Given these outstanding contributions, the recognition by the United Nations is very apt and timely.

Malaysia concurs with the two functions entrusted by the World Summit to the Economic and Social Council — the Annual Ministerial Review and the Biennial Development Cooperation Forum — whose aim is to ensure the effective implementation of the development agenda. It is important also that the Council work as a system and continue to adopt the themes of reviews well in advance in order to give the various actors sufficient time to contribute to its deliberations.

Looking ahead, Malaysia believes that the Council should review its role within the United Nations system in the integrated follow-up to conferences and the modalities for actors within the Organization to contribute to such follow-up. To promote coherence, coordination and integration of the United Nations apparatus, the Council should also continue to look into the most appropriate modalities for follow-up to major conferences and summits.

The deadline for achieving the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) targets is fast approaching. While some progress has been made, it is well known that many developing countries, in particular the least developed countries, are still far from achieving their MDG targets by 2015. The challenges we face today are different from those of some years ago. The current global landscape, financial and economic pressures and environmental issues are hampering countries' efforts

to achieve global development goals. In this regard, we urge all countries to re-strategize and realign their approaches to economic and social development.

Malaysia is also of the view that the efforts to eradicate extreme poverty should be complemented by efforts to provide better access to basic infrastructure, and that equal priority should be given to improving access to basic services. To this end, our partners from developed countries can continue to assist us in poverty eradication in the developing world by continuing to fulfil their official development assistance commitments. While we recognize that our partners may be facing economic difficulties at home, we are confident that such difficulties will not prevent them from fulfilling their official development assistance commitments, as agreed at numerous United Nations conferences.

The 2010 MDG review shows that Malaysia has attained, or is on track to attain, the MDGs at aggregate level by 2015. In 2009, the poverty rate in Malaysia decreased to 3.8 per cent and, just last year, 63,147 poor households were elevated under the 1AZAM programme, a hardcore poverty eradication programme of the Malaysian Government. In order to plan, implement and monitor poverty eradication programmes, Malaysia introduced a monitoring system, called e-Kasih, in November 2007. E-Kasih was awarded first prize in the United Nations Public Service Awards for 2012, in recognition of its significant contribution to poverty eradication. The e-Kasih is a database system created at the national level to collect data on poor families in Malaysia; it ensures the fair distribution of assistance and avoids overlap between the aid programmes of multiple Government agencies.

The progress made towards achieving the MDGs has encouraged Malaysia to further improve other key areas of development in rural areas through the adoption of effective policy actions. The Government has also established the necessary framework, which comprises four main pillars as drivers of change. These pillars are the six national key result areas, as outlined in the Government Transformation Programme, the 12 national key economic areas of the Economic Transformation Programme, the strategic economic reforms in the New Economic Model, and the tenth Malaysia Plan. These four pillars, which put emphasis on inclusiveness and sustainability, are intended to be the bas for propelling Malaysia forward towards becoming a high-income nation by 2020.

As the deadline for achieving the MDG targets is less than three years away, Malaysia would like to reaffirm its commitment to joining the rest of the international community in further accelerating progress towards the MDGs by 2015 and actively contributing to the United Nations development agenda beyond 2015, including the fashioning of sustainable development goals. In this respect, we are pleased to note that Malaysia has become an increasingly active international partner for development and will continue to share its knowledge and experience in economic and social development with other developing countries. As an active player in South-South cooperation, Malaysia has offered its expertise in areas of capacity-building and human-capital development to fellow developing countries, mainly through the Malaysian Technical Cooperation Programme. Since the Programme's launch in 1980, more than 25,000 participants from 140 countries have benefited from it.

I would like to conclude by reaffirming Malaysia's commitment to implementing the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences in the economic, social and related fields by pursuing a development policy framework that is focused on high growth through sustained, inclusive and equitable economic, social and environmental policies, guided by the principles and objectives of sustainable development.

Mr. Maksimychev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like to thank Ambassador De Alba, Vice-President of the Economic and Social Council, for presenting the Council's report (A/67/3), and to express my gratitude to the Secretariat for having supported the work of the Council this year.

The Russian delegation has consistently advocated the strengthening of the Council's coordination role within the United Nations development system. We view the Council as a key United Nations forum for crafting collective approaches to pressing social and economic problems.

We welcome the convening of the special ministerial meeting of the Economic and Social Council on the issue of strengthening the multilateral system for sustainable development in September. The outcome of that discussion provided a firm basis for holding a second round of consultations on reviewing progress in the implementation of General Assembly resolution 61/16 on the strengthening of the Council during this session of the General Assembly.

In our view, the primary task of that review is to define the Council's role in negotiating and implementing new priorities for the post-2015 socioeconomic agenda and in the emerging global structure for international development cooperation. As part of the review, we also look forward to in-depth discussions of ways to optimize the agenda and the programme of work of the Council's substantive session.

Further work on reforming the socioeconomic sector of the United Nations must be based on the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (resolution 66/288, annex). We believe that the establishment of a high-level forum on sustainable development is an integral part of the process of strengthening the Economic and Social Council and its subsidiary bodies.

Overall, we commend the outcome of the Council's substantive session this year, including the Annual Ministerial Review on the progress towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals and the Development Cooperation Forum. We note the useful work with regard to coordinating the operational activities and humanitarian affairs segments of the session. That clearly reaffirms the Council's important role in ensuring system-wide coherence and the required and effective implementation of the priorities on the global social and economic agenda.

For the first time since 2006, the United Nations platform was used for a comprehensive discussion under the theme of all aspects of employment. The political guidelines for United Nations work in that area were set out. Without infringing on the leading role and the prerogatives of the International Labour Organization, the Council was able to provide significant updates on the decent-work issues on the United Nations agenda.

The ministerial declaration, based on the outcomes of the review, has become a firm normative basis for strengthening the work and enhancing the coherence and coordination of all United Nations structures and bodies. Decisions within the Economic and Social Council must seek to further enhance multilateral development cooperation and the effective implementation of the concept of decent work.

The contributions of the Economic and Social Council will be duly taken into account in preparing for the International High-level Conference on Decent Work, to be held in Moscow in December. During the session, the Russian representative made a national voluntary presentation that reflected the national strategy and practical measures undertaken by our country to promote sustained and fair economic growth, to improve the social well-being of the population and to ensure further progress in achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

Allow me once again to express my gratitude to delegations for their active and constructive participation in discussing the report. In 2012, the Economic and Social Council reaffirmed its key role in the process of intergovernmental follow-up to the various international conferences on financing for development. We welcome the outcome of the special high-level meeting of the Economic and Social Council with the Bretton Woods institutions, the World Trade Organization and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. We also welcome the efforts of the President and the Bureau of the Council to establish informal contacts, in particular with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

One of the Council's priorities should be to continue expanding mutually beneficial cooperation between the United Nations and international financial and trade institutions, the private sector and non-governmental organizations so as to effectively implement the international development agenda.

The Russian Federation is ready to cooperate constructively with all partners in order to further strengthen the Economic and Social Council, given the role of the United Nations in global economic governance.

Mrs. Martinic (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): Argentina would like to thank Ambassador De Alba for presenting the annual report of the Economic and Social Council (A/67/3).

The United Nations must play a central role in world governance so that the international community can adequately respond to the many and increasing global challenges. Apart from the urgency of the topics addressed by the Security Council, which means that its decisions always seem to be critical and to appear on the front pages of the press, the daily challenges in relation to economic and social development that are faced by most of the world's population are equally pressing or more so. That is an area where the United Nations is not up to meeting the current challenge. That has become increasingly clear since the end of the Cold War.

Under the Charter, the Economic and Social Council, as a principal organ of the United Nations, has a prominent role in dealing with current challenges, such as promoting a transparent, fair and non-discriminatory international economic system that brings about development, social inclusion and economic growth, in particular in developing countries.

The current reality is that the Council is not able to meet the present economic and social challenges. We must find a way to make it more effective so that it can contribute decisively to the promotion of the three pillars of sustainable development, namely, social development, economic growth and environmental protection. To that end, we believe that the Council's agenda should be streamlined because it currently deals with countless reports on numerous topics without achieving the expected result.

We also believe that the Council should act as a sounding board for discussions taking place both in its subsidiary bodies and in ad hoc forums. Above all, it should be able to take responsibility for the discussion of the main topics in the international economic and social field.

The Council should also undertake the appropriate follow-up to effectively implement the resolutions that it adopts. For example, this year, it adopted a resolution that underscored the need to give the eradication of poverty the highest priority in the United Nations development agenda (E/RES/2012/12). That resolution must be fully implemented.

The Council should generate a vigorous debate on current issues, such as growth with social inclusion, to which Argentina attaches the greatest importance. Through active State policies that focus on employment, social inclusion and industrial growth, Argentina has been able to achieve some of the highest growth rates in the world, while creating jobs and reducing poverty levels. The investment rate reached a record 24.5 per cent of gross domestic product in 2011. We registered a dramatic fall in the unemployment rate from more than 20 per cent in 2002 to 7.2 per cent in the second quarter of 2012.

The Council should invite relevant international organizations, such as the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, to participate in discussions so as to reach solutions to specific social problems. As the Trade and Development Report 2012 notes, in order for growth and development to be inclusive, it is necessary to take active employment and redistribution measures, as well as macroeconomic policies that promote productive investment and create decent jobs. A better distribution of income increases aggregate demand, investment and growth, which, in turn, will accelerate job creation.

Emerging economies continue to foment global growth. It is sufficient to cite the forecasts of the International Monetary Fund for gross domestic product growth for 2012 and 2013. They indicate that emerging and developing economies are proving to be the engines of global growth, with a rate of 5.6 per cent for 2012 and 5.9 per cent for 2013. Meanwhile, the developed economies, the epicentre of the global economic crisis, show a growth forecast of 1.4 per cent in 2012 and 1.9 per cent in 2013.

However, we have been attacked in multilateral forums by some who seek to discourage the use of public policies to which we are legally entitled, in an attempt to limit the scope of our legitimate economic policy. The ultimate goal of such attacks is to enable developed countries to dump their exportable surpluses on our domestic markets, through constrictive fiscal policies that limit global aggregate demand. By contrast, nothing is said in the same forums about the stimulus packages and subsidies that the most powerful economies continue to provide for their own industrial and agricultural sectors and that have harmful repercussions for developing countries. To the formidable sums that in recent years, in response to the international crisis, have been expended on agricultural support for domestic producers, there have been added millions in fiscal and monetary stimulus packages, whose real overall distortive impact is immeasurable.

We are convinced that only a system of global governance based on an efficient, inclusive, representative and transparent multilateral decision-making system, with clear and fair rules, can provide effective solutions to global problems. Prioritizing and strengthening the Economic and Social Council could be a step in that direction. That will depend on the political will of its members.

Ms. Morgan (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would first express our gratitude for the leadership of the President of the Economic and Social Council and of the representatives of Egypt, Indonesia and Spain in conducting the work of the Council in 2012.

A coordinated follow-up to the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences in the economic, social and related fields, as well as the formulation of a coherent, unified and universal post-2015 development agenda, calls for an Economic and Social Council capable of responding to today's challenges. We believe that the Council is the natural forum for a global approach to addressing development-related issues. Nonetheless, the Council, and its system of regional and organic committees, must regain the necessary effectiveness and capacity to be able to define and follow up on a development agenda and to involve the relevant stakeholders. What is needed is a process of thorough institutional reform that will enable the Council to comply fully with its mandate as laid down in Chapter X of the Charter. We are encouraged by the discussion that was initiated during the special ministerial meeting of the Council on 24 September, and we await with interest the report requested of the Secretary-General, with proposals for reform.

The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development reaffirmed the mandate of the Council as one of the principal organs charged with carrying out the integrated and coordinated follow-up to the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social, environmental and related fields, and recognized its decisive contribution to the balanced integration of the three dimensions of sustainable development. A renewed and strengthened Council should be able to fulfil three specific functions: provide leadership and integration capacity; promote coordination and follow-up for a global development agenda; and promote more effective systemic cohesion and coordination. We should also revive the Council's former dynamism, which could be imparted to it by the discussion and formulation of recommendations on serious and important topics that are currently facing the international community.

Reform should be based on the premise that, for the Council to be effective, it needs a systemic approach that can enable it to retain its capacity to act and respond to development's central challenges and to ensure that each of its instruments gives added value. It should do its work in a timely fashion, and to that end should revise its current meeting schedule and end the practice of concentrating too much of its work into a single month of the year. It should also make use of its instruments to create inclusive spaces that can incorporate other actors.

As the coordinating entity for funds and programmes, we should strengthen the Development Cooperation Forum as the central platform from which we can build and reinforce interaction between the principal stakeholders in international cooperation, including the United Nations funds and programmes. We also believe that, with a view to the future post-2015 development agenda, the Council must strengthen its role as a central platform for monitoring progress in commitments made in the area of international development. We should therefore ensure that the annual ministerial review has a solid and inclusive preparatory and follow-up process that is supported by the entire United Nations system.

The reform of our multilateral development institutions is urgent. We should integrate the various fragmented efforts surrounding the Organization's development agenda, take advantage of synergies and avoid dissipating our already scant resources, working within a renewed strategic framework where every one of our actors plays its assigned role. In that context, the mission of the Council should be to generate shared spaces where the relevant actors can make decisions.

Furthermore, the United Nations should not have parallel development agendas. We require an integrated agenda where, once and for all, development is understood to be a single whole that incorporates distinct but mutally complementary and reinforcing pillars. We call on all Member States, without exception, to act and to cooperate with one another to improve the quality of life of their citizens. Finally, with respect to the development agenda, we believe that the high-level political forum established in Rio de Janeiro not only should ensure the convergence between relevant actors at the global level but also should function as a bridge between the Assembly and the Council within the United Nations.

Before concluding, I would like to thank the President of the Assembly, on behalf of Mexico's delegation, for his commitment to developing with the Economic and Social Council a series of processes that can lead the United Nations to renew its development agenda.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on these items. May I take it that the General Assembly takes note of the report of the Economic and Social Council contained in document A/67/3?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda items 9 and 14.

Agenda items 63 and 13 (*continued*)

New Partnership for Africa's Development: progress in implementation and international support

(a) New Partnership for Africa's Development: progress in implementation and international support

Report of the Secretary-General (A/67/204)

(b) Causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa

Report of the Secretary-General (A/67/205)

2001-2010: Decade to Roll Back Malaria in Developing Countries, Particularly in Africa

The Acting President: Members will recall that the General Assembly considered, in a joint debate, agenda item 63 and its sub-items (a) and (b) and agenda item 13 at its 25th and 26th plenary meetings, on 17 October.

Mr. Emvula (Namibia): Namibia aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Cameroon on behalf of the Group of African States (see A/67/PV.25). The social and economic development of the African continent remains an urgent imperative. In order to succeed, we must redouble our collective efforts to improve the productive capacity of our economies and equip our people, especially the youth, with the needed skills and competencies. We should also do more to improve access to public services such as education, health care, housing, electricity and other social amenities. In that regard, we join others in thanking the Secretary-General for his reports (A/67/204 and A/67/205).

Global action to combat malaria has reduced deaths by more than one third, saving 1.1 million lives in sub-Saharan Africa over the past decade. Namibia has also made significant progress in the fight against malaria in the past 10 years. Although Namibia is not yet malaria-free, the number of malaria cases recorded across the country dropped by 97 per cent between 2001 and 2011.

The number of malaria deaths has also decreased from 1,747 in 2001, to a mere 45 in 2010, which is a mortality reduction of 98 per cent. The decline in the number of malaria cases is due to a campaign that includes the distribution of insecticide-treated mosquito nets and massive treatment efforts aimed at people who have contracted malaria. Namibia is on track to achieve malaria elimination by 2015.

African heads of State and Government adopted the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) at the summit in Lusaka, Zambia, in 2001. That decision was hailed in Africa and by the international community at large as a milestone and an important paradigm shift in our approach to economic and social development. We have designed NEPAD as a development plan to free our continent and its people from the scourge of poverty and underdevelopment. It is a vision and a programme of priority actions and strategies to guide Africa's way forward. Namibia believes that we need to do more to fulfil the goals we set for ourselves when we established NEPAD.

We are convinced that the implementation and political championing of strategies and the active promotion of Africa's regional infrastructure through the work of the Heads of State and Government in the High-level Subcommittee on Infrastructure will ensure the success of NEPAD and the African Union in their efforts to find adequate funding for the projects we have identified and defined in accordance with our developmental needs.

In conclusion, let me underline that the primary responsibility for funding projects for Africa's development lies with Africans. Others should only complement our efforts. I therefore wish to appeal to all of the international community to demonstrate the political will required and to match our commitments with financial resources. Africa rose to the seemingly daunting challenge of defeating colonialism. Now is the time for us to rise to the challenge of Africa's economic development with the assistance of the international community — led by the Office of the Special Adviser of the Secretary-General on Africa — and with equal determination and creative energy.

Mr. Elmajerbi (Libya) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, I would like to extend my thanks to the Secretary-General for his two reports (A/67/204 and A/67/205) on the item under discussion. I express my delegation's solidarity with the statements made at the

25th meeting by the representative of Cameroon, on behalf of the African States, and by the representative of Egypt, on behalf of the Group of Arab States.

After the adoption of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) as the framework for Africa's socioeconomic development, the African countries have adopted political strategies and measures to carry out NEPAD's sectoral priorities, with the support of the international community.

African countries have achieved remarkable progress in consolidating democracy, human rights and good governance, as well as sound economic management. Yet, there have been noticeable adverse repercussions resulting from the world economic and financial crisis, including price fluctuations in energy and foodstuffs, and increased challenges owing to climate change, including drought, soil degradation, desertification and the loss of biological diversity. There have also been negative impacts on the fight against hunger and poverty and on the achievement of the internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

Given that the African continent has been one of the worst affected by the world economic and financial crisis and despite the return of growth internationally, Africa remains vulnerable with inconsistent growth. It is therefore necessary to foster national efforts to achieve food security in Africa through increased allocations to agriculture and rural development in the budgets of the African countries and to ensure better and sounder management. In that regard, the international community must play a role in providing technological and financial support as well as modern agrarian skills to increase production and improve quality.

The fact that trade plays an important role in Africa in promoting economic growth, creating employment opportunities, especially given the huge unemployment we face, and achieving the MDGs, there is an urgent need to rectify trade practices that run counter to the rules of the World Trade Organization. All States, relevant institutions and multilateral entities should align their policies with those of the African States and provide assistance to strengthen trade, aimed at overcoming the existing challenges in order to ensure that Africa is on track to achieve free and fair trade.

Given the cardinal role of official development assistance in making progress on achieving sustainable development in developing countries, developed countries must fulfil the commitments made in the course of the major United Nations conferences on Africa. That requires all development partners, in particular the developed countries, to back the developing African countries by fostering investment and creating policies conducive to encouraging local and foreign investment. That is particularly necessary as desertification, land degradation and drought have had adverse effects on African efforts to achieve development.

To further regional efforts to address the problem, the international community should assist Africa in implementing the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa. As a member of NEPAD, Libya will continue to actively cooperate with African States to advance the NEPAD agenda for progress, growth and prosperity for African countries, through joint action, coordination and compliance with cooperation agreements concluded with numerous African States in the past. We will strive thereby for the MDGs to be achieved and for African countries to take their natural role in the international economic system, especially since they possess the valuable human and natural resources necessary for them to reach the goals they have set.

The Acting President: In accordance with General Assembly resolution 49/2 of 19 October 1994, I now call on the observer for the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

Mr. Lobry-Boulanger (International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies): The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) supports the adoption last month of resolution 66/289, entitled "Consolidating gains and accelerating efforts to control and eliminate malaria in developing countries, particularly in Africa, by 2015". We also welcome the inclusion of malaria among the Secretary-General's priorities for his second term.

We have collectively made significant progress in the fight against malaria over the past 10 years, as highlighted in the World Health Organization's 2011 *World Malaria Report*. We know that our success is the result of a significant scaling up of malaria prevention and control measures, including the widespread ownership and increased use of bednets, better diagnostics and the wider availability of effective medicines to treat malaria.

Despite those significant results, gains remain inequitable. While some countries are moving towards the elimination of malaria, many others continue to suffer unacceptably high burdens of the disease and require a rapid increase in prevention and control efforts.

We must not take recent hard-won advances in the global fight against malaria for granted. The gains made are fragile. Collectively, we must do more, do better and reach further. The IFRC calls for greater recognition, support and investment in community-based solutions, including a focus on the most vulnerable, marginalized and hard-to-reach communities, in order to ensure equitable access to malaria prevention, diagnosis and treatment. Malaria is first managed in homes and communities, and it will be at that level that we will continue to see the biggest returns on investment by empowering individuals to take informed action against the disease.

The Red Cross and Red Crescent national societies and their community-based volunteers have played a crucial role in our global success to date. Those volunteers, who are intimately aware of local barriers to health interventions, are working in communities to expand the reach of prevention and control measures. Volunteers go door-to-door to ensure installation and proper care of nets, provide information on how to effectively prevent the disease, identify where to access diagnosis and treatment and promote rapid treatment-seeking behaviour for pregnant women and children under 5 years of age in order to stop preventable malaria deaths.

New technology is also playing a role. In Haiti, for example, the Red Cross, in addition to targeted distributions in at-risk communities, is using mobile technology to put life-saving information directly into the hands of people through a nationwide malaria prevention campaign that has included over 3.5 million SMS messages sent.

The IFRC believes that malaria control and reaching the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) will depend on sustained and increased funding support, as well as on political commitment. For instance, just by scaling up efforts to prevent malaria, including universal coverage with mosquito nets, an estimated 3 million children's lives will be saved by 2015.

Sustaining malaria-control efforts is an investment in development. Early and continued investment in malaria control will greatly assist malaria-endemic countries along the path to achieving the MDGs, especially those relating to improving child survival and maternal health, eradicating extreme poverty and expanding access to education. Furthermore, malaria funding can be used as a gateway for the integration of other key health services to address MDGs 4 and 5, thus offering a synergistic solution to resource constraints globally and within countries.

The power of partnership is one of the most important pieces in the fight against malaria. Malaria is the cause of massive human suffering, and the international community must play a greater role in supporting global partnerships to fight malaria. International efforts to scale up the proven, cost-effective tools available to prevent and control malaria must be maintained. However, in order to avoid the pitfalls experienced in past efforts to eradicate malaria, including growing resistance to insecticide and drugs, we must continue to invest in research and develop initiatives to stay ahead of the mosquito and the parasite. We cannot risk reversing today's gains and losing countless more lives to a preventable and treatable disease.

The Acting President: I thank the observer for the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

We have heard the last speaker in the debate on sub-items (a) and (b) of agenda item 63 and agenda item 13. The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of those agenda items.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.

United Nations A/67/PV.29

General Assembly

Sixty-seventh session

Official Records

29th plenary meeting
Thursday, 1 November 2012, 10 a.m.
New York

President: Mr. Jeremić ..... (Serbia)

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

Agenda item 71

Report of the International Court of Justice

Report of the International Court of Justice (A/67/4)

The President: It is now my great honour to welcome to the United Nations Headquarters His Excellency Mr. Peter Tomka, President of the International Court of Justice, and to give him the floor.

Mr. Tomka, President of the International Court of Justice (*spoke in French*): At the outset, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Vuk Jeremić upon his election to preside over the General Assembly at its sixty-seventh session. I wish him the greatest of success in the discharge of his important functions.

Following a well-established tradition reflecting the Assembly's interest in the Court and its support of the Court, I would like to present a succinct report of the judicial activity of the court over the past 12 months. During this period, the Court continued to fulfil its role as the privileged forum of the international community of States for the peaceful settlement of all sorts of international disputes that it has the jurisdiction to address. It made every effort to meet the expectations of the international parties appearing before it in a timely manner. It should be noted in this regard that as the Court has been able to clear its backlog of cases, States that are contemplating submitting cases to the principal judicial organ of the United Nations can be confident that, as soon as they are finished their written exchanges, the Court will be able to proceed without delay to oral hearings.

During the reporting period, as many as 15 contentious cases and one advisory procedure were pending before the Court. On 31 July, 11 contentious cases remained before the Court. During the same period, one new contentious case was submitted to the Court by Nicaragua, concerning *Construction of a Road in Costa Rica along the San Juan River (Nicaragua v. Costa Rica)*.

During the same period, the Court held a series of public hearings on the following three cases: *Jurisdictional Immunities of the State (Germany v. Italy: Greece intervening)*; *Questions relating to the Obligation to Prosecute or Extradite (Belgium v. Senegal)*; and *Territorial and Maritime Dispute (Nicaragua v. Colombia)*. The Court is at present deliberating this last case and intends to deliver its judgment in the course of the next month. It also recently held, from 8 to 17 October, hearings in the case concerning *Frontier Dispute (Burkina Faso/Niger)* and has begun its deliberations. Lastly, hearings will begin in the case concerning the *Maritime Dispute (Peru v. Chile)* on 3 December.

During the reporting period, the Court delivered four judgments in the following cases: *Application of the Interim Accord of 13 September 1995 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia v. Greece)*; *Jurisdictional Immunities of the State (Germany v. Italy: Greece intervening)*; *Ahmadou Sadio Diallo*

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

12-56915 (E)

Please recycle

(Republic of Guinea v. Democratic Republic of the Congo), on the question of compensation owed to Guinea; and *Questions relating to the Obligation to Prosecute or Extradite (Belgium v. Senegal)*. The Court also delivered an advisory opinion concerning Judgment No. 2867 of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization upon a Complaint Filed against the International Fund for Agricultural Development.

As I usually do, I will report briefly on the four Judgments and the advisory opinion delivered by the International Court of Justice under the period under review. I shall deal with these decisions in chronological order.

On 5 December 2011, the Court delivered its Judgment in the case concerning *Application of the Interim Accord of 13 September 1995 (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia v. Greece)*, which had been brought in November 2008 by the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia against Greece for what is described as the "flagrant violation of [that country's] obligations under Article 11" of the Interim Accord signed by the parties on 13 September 1995. After asking the Court in its application to

> "protect its rights under the Interim Accord and to ensure that it is allowed to exercise its rights as an independent State acting in accordance with international law, including the right to pursue membership of relevant international organizations",

the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia requested the Court to order Greece to "immediately take all necessary steps to comply with its obligations under Article 11, paragraph 1" and to

> "cease and desist from objecting in any way, whether directly or indirectly, to the Applicant's membership of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and/or of any other 'international, multilateral and regional organizations and institutions' of which [Greece] is a member".

Greece, for its part, considered that the case brought by the applicant did not fall within the jurisdiction of the Court and that in any case the applicant's claims were inadmissible. It argued in the alternative that were the Court to find that it had jurisdiction and that the claims were admissible, those claims were without foundation.

With regard to the respondent's objections as to the jurisdiction of the Court and the admissibility of the applicant's claims, the Court ruled that it not only had jurisdiction to entertain the application filed but also that the application was admissible.

As for the second part of the applicant's claims, the Court found that the Hellenic Republic, by objecting to the admission of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to NATO, had violated its obligation under article 11, paragraph 1, of the Interim Accord. The Court rejected all other submissions made by the applicant.

On 3 February, the Court rendered its Judgment in the case concerning *Jurisdictional Immunities of the State (Germany v. Italy: Greece intervening)*. On 23 December 2008, Germany filed an application instituting proceedings against Italy, whereby it requested the Court to find that Italy had failed to respect the jurisdictional immunity enjoyed by Germany under international law by allowing civil claims to be brought against it in the Italian courts seeking reparations for injuries by violations of international humanitarian law committed by the German Reich during the Second World War. Germany also requested that the Court find that Italy had also violated Germany's immunity by taking enforcement measures against Villa Vigoni, German State property situated in Italian territory, and that Italy had further breached Germany's jurisdictional immunity by declaring enforceable in Italy decisions of Greek civil courts rendered against Germany for acts similar to those which had given rise to the claims brought before Italian courts.

Consequently, Germany requested the Court to adjudge and declare that Italy's international responsibility was triggered; that Italy must, by means of its own choosing, take any and all necessary steps to ensure that all the decisions of its courts and other judicial authorities infringing Germany's sovereign immunity be without effect; and that Italy must take any and all necessary steps to ensure that in the future Italian courts do not entertain legal actions against Germany founded upon the aforementioned occurrences.

In its ruling, the Court found that Italy had violated its obligation to respect the immunity that Germany enjoys under international law by allowing civil claims to be brought against it based on violations of international humanitarian law committed by the German Reich between 1943 and 1945; that Italy had violated its obligation to respect the immunity which Germany enjoys under international law by taking

enforcement measures against Villa Vigoni; and that Italy had violated its obligation to respect the immunity that Germany enjoys under international law by declaring enforceable in Italy decisions by Greek courts based on violations of international humanitarian law committed in Greece by the German Reich. The Court also found that Italy must, by enacting appropriate legislation or by resorting to other methods of its choosing, ensure that the decisions of its courts and those of other judicial authorities infringing the immunity which Germany enjoys under international law cease to have effect.

In September, the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs and Minister of Justice of Italy, in agreement with the Minister of Economy and Finance, presented draft legislation to the Italian Chamber of Deputies providing for the authorization of ratification by Italy of the United Nations Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and Their Property and its implementation. Furthermore, the draft legislation also addresses the effect in the Italian legal system of the judgment of the Court in the aforementioned case so as to ensure compliance with that decision.

On 19 June, the Court delivered its third ruling during the period under review in the case concerning *Ahmadou Sadio Diallo (Republic of Guinea v. Democratic Republic of the Congo)*. That ruling concerned the question of compensation owed by the Democratic Republic of the Congo to Guinea. It should be recalled that, in the ruling on the merits of 30 November 2010, the Court had found, inter alia, that the Democratic Republic of the Congo had violated certain international obligations as a result of Mr. Diallo, a Guinean national, having been continuously detained in Congolese territory for 66 consecutive days between November 1995 and January 1996, and of his having been detained for a second time between 25 and 31 January 1996, for a total of 72 days.

In that regard, the Court had found that Guinea had failed to demonstrate that Mr. Diallo had been subjected to inhuman or degrading treatment during his detentions. In addition, it was found that Mr. Diallo had been expelled by the Democratic Republic of the Congo on 31 January 1996 and that he had received the notification of his expulsion on the same day. Accordingly, the Court had stated that the Democratic Republic of the Congo was required to compensate Guinea for breaches of its obligations under certain human rights conventions, namely the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights. Under the terms of the ruling on the merits, it followed that the amount of compensation to be paid by the Democratic Republic of the Congo had to be set for any damages resulting from the wrongful detention and expulsion of Mr. Diallo, including the resulting loss of his personal belongings.

In the final stage of the proceedings, Guinea sought compensation amounting to $11,590,148, not including statutory default interest on four counts of damages: one non-material count referred to by Guinea as "psychological and moral damage" and three counts of material damage for alleged loss of personal property, alleged loss of professional remuneration suffered by Mr. Diallo during his detentions and after his expulsion, and alleged deprivation of potential earnings. Guinea also requested the Court to order the Democratic Republic of the Congo not only to pay all the costs, but also to pay it the amount of $500,000 for costs it had been forced to incur in the proceedings. The Democratic Republic of the Congo, for its part, requested the Court to adjudge that compensation in an amount of $30,000, payable within a time limit of six months from the date of the Court's ruling, was due to Guinea to make good on the non-material harm suffered by Mr. Diallo as a result of his wrongful detentions and expulsion in 1995 and 1996. The Democratic Republic of the Congo rejected all other claims by Guinea.

In ruling on the non-material harm alleged by Guinea, the Court considered that the amount of $85,000 would provide appropriate compensation for the damage suffered by Mr. Diallo. With regard to the compensation for material damage, the Court, relying on the jurisprudence of regional human rights courts, awarded the sum of $10,000 for the loss of Mr. Diallo's personal property. Having then found that Guinea had not proven to the satisfaction of the Court that Mr. Diallo had suffered a loss of professional remuneration during his detentions and following his expulsion, the Court decided to award no compensation for that injury. Lastly, the Court decided to award no compensation to Guinea in respect of its claim relating to potential earnings of Mr. Diallo, insofar as that claim, which was beyond the scope of those proceedings, amounted to a claim relating to the injuries alleged to have been caused to Africom-Zaire and Africontainers-Zaire, while the Court had already declared those claims inadmissible.

After fixing 31 August 2012 as the deadline for the payment of compensation owed by the Democratic Republic of the Congo to Guinea with post-Judgment interest accruing at an annual rate of 6 per cent in the event of late payment, the Court decided that each party should bear its own procedural costs. The Court was informed that the compensation was duly paid by the Democratic Republic of the Congo within the time limit fixed for that purpose.

(*spoke in English*)

I now come to the Judgment granted by the Court in the case concerning *Questions Relating to the Obligation to Prosecute or Extradite (Belgium v. Senegal)*. In that case, which it submitted to the Court by means of an application dated 19 February 2009, Belgium complained that Senegal, where the former Chadian President Hissène Habré had been living in exile since 1990, had taken no action on its repeated requests to ensure that the latter be brought to trial in Senegal, failing his extradition to Belgium, for acts characterized as torture, crimes against humanity, war crimes and the crime of genocide, allegedly committed while he was President of Chad between 1982 and 1990.

Belgium contended that Senegal was in breach of its obligations under article 5, paragraph 2; article 6, paragraph 2; and article 7, paragraph ,1 of the 1984 Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and its obligations under customary international law. Senegal, for its part, submitted that there was no dispute between the parties with regard to the interpretation or application of the Convention against Torture or any other relevant rules of international law. According to the respondent, the Court therefore elected jurisdiction in the case.

Arguing in particular that none of the alleged victims of the acts attributed to Mr. Habré was of Belgian nationality at the time the acts were committed, Senegal also objected to the admissibility of Belgium's claims because, in its view, the latter was not entitled to invoke the international responsibility of Senegal for the alleged breach of its obligation to submit the case of Hissène Habré to its competent authorities for the purpose of prosecution, failing his extradition.

Given that the existence of a dispute was a condition of the jurisdiction of the Court on both bases of jurisdiction invoked by Belgium — namely, article 30, paragraph 1 of the Convention against Torture and the declarations made by the parties under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court — the Court began by considering that question. It found that, in view of the legislative and constitutional reforms carried out in Senegal in 2007 and 2008, any dispute that might have existed between the parties with regard to the interpretation or application of article 5, paragraph 2 of the Convention — which requires a State party to the Convention to take such measures as may be necessary to establish its jurisdiction over acts of torture in cases where the alleged offender is present in any territory under its jurisdiction if it does not extradite him pursuant to article 8 to any of the States mentioned in paragraph 1 of the same article — had ended by the time the application was filed.

As regards Belgium's claims relating to Senegal's duties to comply with its obligations under article 6, paragraph 2, and article 7, paragraph 1 of the Convention against Torture, which respectively require a State party to the Convention to immediately make a preliminary inquiry into the facts when a person who has allegedly committed an act of torture is found on its territory and, if it does not extradite him, to submit the case to its competent authorities for the purpose of prosecution, the Court, after analysing the diplomatic exchanges between the parties, found that they had conflicting views concerning the interpretation and application of the aforementioned provisions at the time of the filing of the application. However, the Court considered that the dispute which had thus arisen did not relate to breaches of obligations under customary international law.

After recalling that, in the words of its preamble, the object and purpose of the Convention against Torture is to make more effective the struggle against torture throughout the world, the Court found that Belgium, as a State party to the Convention, had standing to invoke the responsibility of Senegal for the alleged breaches of its obligations *erga omnes partes* under article 6, paragraph 2, and article 7, paragraph 1. The claims of Belgium based on those provisions were thus declared admissible.

After assessing questions relating to the merits, the Court found that Senegal had violated its obligations under the two aforementioned provisions of the Convention and that its international responsibility had been triggered. Noting the continuing nature of those violations, it declared that Senegal was required to cease them by taking without further delay the necessary measures to submit the case to its competent

authorities for the purpose of prosecution if it does not extradite Mr. Habré.

I shall now turn to the Court's advisory opinion concerning the Judgment of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization upon a Complaint Filed against the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). In that case, the Court was asked to examine the validity of a judgment granted by the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization concerning the employment contract of Ms. Saez Garcia. It should be recalled that the latter had accepted from the International Fund for Agricultural Development an offer of a two-year fixed term contract serving as a programme officer in the Global Mechanism, an institution housed at the Fund. The employment contract had been renewed on two occasions.

The Tribunal was seized of a dispute concerning the decision of the President of the Fund to reject the recommendations of the Joint Appeals Board of the Fund following several internal procedures relating to the non-renewal of the contract of the individual concerned and the abolition of her post. In its judgment, the Court set aside the President's decision and ordered the Fund to pay damages and expenses. In the course of the advisory proceedings before the Court, the Fund asserted in particular that Ms. Saez Garcia was a staff member of the Global Mechanism and not of IFAD, and that her employment status had to be assessed in the context of the arrangement for the housing of the Global Mechanism made between the Fund and the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa.

After examining the texts defining the respective powers of and relations between IFAD and the Global Mechanism, the Court came to the conclusion that the Global Mechanism, which is devoid of any international legal personality, had no power and had not purported to exercise any power to enter into contracts, agreements or arrangements internationally or nationally. With respect to Ms. Saez Garcia's employment status, the Court found that there was an employment relationship between her and the Fund, given that the staff regulations and the rules of the Fund were applicable to her. Accordingly, the Court unanimously found that the Administrative Tribunal was competent under article 2 of its Statute to hear the complaint introduced against IFAD by Ms. Saez Garcia and that the decision given by the Tribunal in its judgment was valid.

In the light of its concern about the inequality of access to the Court arising from the review procedure provided for in article XII of the annex to the statute of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization, the Court examined the principle of equality before the Court of the Fund and Ms. Saez Garcia. It declared that the principle of equality must now be understood as including access on an equal basis to available appellate or similar remedies unless an exception can be justified on objective and reasonable grounds. In that regard, the Court questioned whether the system established in 1946 allows for the implementation of the modern-day concept of the principle of equality and access to justice, stating however that it did not fall to it to reform the current system.

While the United Nations reformed its system of administrative justice some time ago, it nevertheless remains impossible to request review of a judgment of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization. In fact, the opportunity to challenge a judgment of the Tribunal is available only to international organizations duly authorized to do so under the statute of the Administrative Tribunal, and not to any staff member affected by such a decision. In that regard, the question arises as to whether the time has come for the International Labour Organization to also consider initiating a reform of the current system, such as that already being carried out by the United Nations.

Turning to more practical matters, I am delighted to tell the Assembly that the Court is refurbishing the Great Hall of Justice at the Peace Palace.

That project, which has received the support of the Carnegie Foundation, is the first major renovation of the Hall in a hundred years. In the past, minor work was carried out to extend the bench to accommodate the enlarged composition of the Court's predecessor, the Permanent Court of International Justice. However, no renovation on the scale of the current project has previously been envisaged. Furthermore, the newly renovated Great Hall of Justice will also be equipped with improved modern technical facilities offering a wide range of possibilities. I am therefore very pleased to assure the Member States that not only do we hear and shall continue to hear cases to submitted to the Court faithfully and impartially as required by the

noble judicial mission entrusted to the United Nations, but that we are also modernizing the setting in which we exercise that function. We have thus been able to put the funds mobilized by the General Assembly to good use in the refurbishment and renovation project.

I hope I have conveyed to the General Assembly the extent to which the Court seeks to meet the expectations of the international community as a whole, including, as in the last decision that I reviewed, in relation to particular aspects of the law of international organizations. That is why the Court has already discussed the schedule of its judicial work for 2013 and 2014 with a view to fixing several series of hearings. I have already mentioned that hearings will begin in the case concerning *Maritime Dispute (Peru v. Chile)* in December. In addition, the Court envisages holding hearings in April in the case concerning the request for interpretation of the Judgment of 15 June 1962 in the case concerning *Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia v. Thailand)*, and in early summer next year, in the case concerning *Whaling in the Antarctic (Australia v. Japan)*.

Of course, the Court must do its utmost to serve the noble purposes and goals of the United Nations using limited resources, since the Member States allocate less than 1 per cent — exactly 0.8 per cent — of the Organization's regular budget to it. Nevertheless, I hope that I have shown that the Court's recent contributions are not to be measured in terms of the financial resources that sustain it, but against the great progress made by it in the advancement of international justice and the peaceful settlement of disputes between States.

I want to thank the Assembly for giving me this opportunity to address it today. I wish it every success in its sixty-seventh session.

The President: I thank the President of the International Court of Justice.

Mr. Gharibi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM).

The Non-Aligned Movement attaches great importance to agenda item 71, "Report of the International Court of Justice", and takes note of the report, contained in document A/67/4, regarding the activities of the Court between 1 August 2011 and 31 July 2012, as requested by the General Assembly last year in resolution 66/102. I would also like to thank the President of the International Court of Justice for his presentation of the report to the Assembly.

The Non-Aligned Movement reaffirms and underscores its principled positions concerning the peaceful settlement of disputes and the non-use or threat of use of force. The International Court of Justice has a significant role to play in promoting and encouraging the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means, as reflected in the United Nations Charter, and in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered.

The Movement endeavours to generate further progress towards achieving full respect for international law, and in that regard commends the role of the International Court of Justice in promoting the peaceful settlement of international disputes in accordance with the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter and the Statute of the Court, in particular Articles 33 and 94 of the Charter.

With regard to advisory opinions of the Court, the NAM urges the Security Council to make greater use of the International Court of Justice, the principal judicial organ of the United Nations, as a source of advisory opinions and interpretation of relevant norms of international law, and on controversial issues. It further requests the Council to use the Court as a source of interpretation of relevant international law, and urges the Council to consider allowing its decisions to be reviewed by the Court, bearing in mind the need to ensure that they adhere to the United Nations Charter and international law. The Movement also invites the General Assembly, other organs of the United Nations and the duly authorized specialized agencies to request advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice on legal questions arising within the scope of their activities.

The Non-Aligned Movement reaffirms the importance of the Court's unanimous conclusion issued on 8 July 1996 on the question concerning the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*. On this, the International Court of Justice concluded that

> "there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control".

The Non-Aligned Movement continues to call for full respect by Israel, the occupying Power, Member

States and the United Nations of the 9 July 2004 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on *Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory*, and that they consider the possibility of requesting a further advisory opinion from the Court regarding the prolonged Israeli occupation of the Palestinian territory since 1967.

Mr. Rowe (Australia): On behalf of Canada, New Zealand and my own country, Australia — the CANZ group — I would like to thank the President of the International Court of Justice, Judge Tomka, for his informative report on the work of the Court for the period 1 August 2011 to 31 July 2012 (A/67/4).

CANZ continues to strongly support the Court in its role as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. The sustained caseload of the Court, covering a diversity of subject matter and geographic circumstance, demonstrates the universal appeal of the International Court of Justice and the vital role it plays in the promotion of the rule of law.

As we review the Court's work over the reporting period, we see that cases before the Court are increasing in factual and legal complexity and continue to include issues at the forefront of international justice. We commend the Court for its ongoing efforts to increase its efficiency and sustain its increased workload. In that regard, we welcome President Tomka's statement to the States Members of the United Nations in September this year that the Court has more than doubled its work rate since 1990.

During the period under review, the Court has, as President Tomka mentioned, handed down four judgments, one advisory opinion and three orders, and it has now successfully cleared its backlog of cases. Nevertheless, we know that the agenda of the Court in the year ahead will remain heavily charged, as countries continue to affirm their confidence in the Court and its primary role in the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

CANZ also welcomes the increased public accessibility to the work of the Court and the Court's efforts to ensure the greatest possible public awareness through the Court's publications, multimedia and website, which now features the full body of the Court's jurisprudence.

CANZ strongly believes that wider acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court would enable it to fulfil its role more effectively by permitting the Court to move beyond jurisdictional issues and to the substance of disputes more quickly. Accordingly, we continue to urge Member States that have not done so to deposit with the Secretary-General a declaration of acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction.

Finally, Canada, New Zealand and Australia would like to express their appreciation for the tremendous contributions of Judges Koroma, Simma and Al-Khasawneh to the development of international law through their work as members of the Court, and we wish them all well in their future endeavours. We also congratulate Judges Bhandari, Gaja and Sebutinde on their recent election to the Court.

Ms. Heptulla (India): I extend my sincere gratitude to Judge Peter Tomka, President of the International Court of Justice, for his comprehensive and detailed report (A/67/4) covering the judicial activities of the Court over the past year. I also thank him and Vice-President Judge Bernardo Sepúlveda-Amor for their leadership of the Court over that period.

India attaches the highest importance to the Court as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. The foremost purpose of the United Nations is the maintenance of international peace and security. The peaceful settlement of international disputes is fundamental to achieving that objective. The Court has fulfilled admirably the task of resolving disputes peacefully since its establishment.

The Court remains the only judicial body with legitimacy derived from the United Nations Charter and enjoying universal character with general jurisdiction, whereas other international judicial institutions have competence and jurisdiction in specific areas only. The Statute of the International Court of Justice is an integral part of the Charter. This is a unique status enjoyed by the Court among the international courts and tribunals.

As stated in the Preamble to the Charter, one of the primary goals of the United Nations is to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations of international law can be maintained. The International Court of Justice, as the only international court with general international law jurisdiction, is uniquely placed to fulfil that role. The report of the Court clearly illustrates the confidence that States have reposed in it, as shown by the number and scope of cases entrusted to it and the Court's growing specialization

in complex aspects of public international law. This clearly establishes the universality of the Court.

During the past year, the Court has handed down four judgments and one advisory opinion. The Court has in one judgment highlighted the significance of the principle of the sovereign immunity of States. In another judgment, the Court has confirmed the relevance of the principle of either prosecute or extradite. The Court's docket of pending cases has grown consistently in factual and legal complexity. Presently, the number of pending contentious cases stands at 11, involving States all over the world.

Since its inception, the Court has dealt with a variety of complex legal issues. The subject matter of cases before the Court has varied widely, including territorial and maritime disputes, environmental damage, violation of territorial integrity, violation of international humanitarian law and human rights, genocide, and the interpretation and application of international treaties.

The Court has remained highly sensitive in respecting the political realities and sentiments of States, while acting within the provisions of the United Nations Charter, its own Statute and other applicable international law. The Court has contributed significantly towards settling legal disputes between sovereign States, thus promoting the rule of law in international relations. Through its second function of providing advisory opinions on legal questions referred to it by organs of the United Nations and specialized agencies, the Court continues to fulfil the important role of clarifying key international law issues.

I am glad to note that the Court has taken significant steps in recent years to enhance its own efficiency in order to be able to cope with the steady increase in its workload. We are happy to note that, accordingly, the Court has successfully cleared its backlog of cases, which further strengthens the confidence of States in the Court's competency and efficiency.

I wish to reiterate in my concluding remarks the great importance the international community attaches to the work of the International Court of Justice, and to draw the Assembly's attention to the importance of strengthening the functioning of the Court by providing all necessarily required means.

Mr. Galea (Romania): Romania is a strong supporter of the role played by the International Court of Justice in the promotion of the rule of law in international relations. My country has been involved twice in the recent past in proceedings before the International Court of Justice. I have in mind the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Black Sea (Romania v. Ukraine)*, which was settled by the Court by a Judgment rendered unanimously on 3 February 2009, and the proceedings of the advisory opinion on the question of the accordance with international law of the unilateral declaration of independence in respect of Kosovo. We have thus had the opportunity to convince ourselves of the efficiency and the professionalism, as well as the full impartiality, of the Court. We are confident that the submission of disputes to international adjudication is preferable to protracted bilateral talks and is capable of removing sensitive issues from the political agenda.

The increasing number of cases on the docket of the Court and the reference to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in numerous conventions of universal application stand as proof of the expanding role of the Court.

The judgments and the advisory opinion issued in the past year gave, in our opinion, important clues about the current stage of certain issues of customary international law. In particular, the judgment in the case concerning *Jurisdictional Immunities of the State (Germany v. Italy: Greece intervening)* offered guidance with respect to the customary international norms concerning an issue that we consider to be important — the immunity of States. Moreover, we note that the judgment in the case concerning *Questions relating to the Obligation to Prosecute or Extradite (Belgium v. Senegal)* not only provided for the interpretation and application of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, but also made a clear statement on the fact that the prohibition of torture has become part of peremptory norms of international law, or *jus cogens*.

The Court is the highest judicial organ of the United Nations and has an acknowledged body of pre-eminent professionals in the legal field. We think that the United Nations and its Member States must do everything to maintain and consolidate its high professional status and to improve the procedures before the Court, while complying with its Statute. We acknowledge some recent debates related to an International Court of Justice bar meant to improve the quality of legal representation before the Court.

Given our firm support for the International Court of Justice, we intend to start a national debate concerning the possibility of accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

Mr. Bonifaz (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to thank the President of the International Court of Justice, Judge Peter Tomka, for being here this morning and for his interesting presentation on the intensive work carried out by the Court from 1 August 2011 to 31 July 2012.

The establishment of the International Court of Justice as a principal organ of the United Nations sought to create a universal system allowing States to resolve their differences peacefully. This year, we celebrate the thirtieth anniversary of the Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes, which was adopted by consensus on 15 November 1982, in resolution 37/10. In this regard, it is always worth recalling that the Manila Declaration reiterates that legal disputes should, as a general rule, be submitted by the parties to the International Court of Justice and that this submission should not be considered an unfriendly act by States.

Moreover, this session of the General Assembly is of particular significance for the work of the Court, since the President of the General Assembly himself, during his statement at the general debate of the sixty-seventh session of the Assembly, invited all States to speak under the theme of "Bringing about adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations by peaceful means". That is why the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Peru, during his statement in the general debate, stated that:

> "Peru reaffirms its full respect for the work of the Court and calls on States to turn to it to resolve their differences and to respect and comply with its decisions, pursuant to Chapter XIV of the United Nations Charter." (*A/67/PV.14, p. 37*)

Likewise, on 24 September, the High-level Meeting on the Rule of Law at the National and International Levels was held and a Declaration (resolution 67/1) adopted, recognizing the positive contribution of the International Court of Justice and the importance of its work in promoting the rule of law. The Declaration of the High-level Meeting of the General Assembly on the Rule of Law at the National and International Levels reaffirms, among other things, the obligation of States to respect and comply with the decisions of the Court — an obligation that arises specifically and directly from Article 94 of the Charter.

Consequently, Peru believes it extremely important that the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice be universally accepted by all States. According to the Court's latest report (A/67/4), to date 67 States have accepted it, pursuant to paragraph 2 of article 36 of its Statute. In that regard, Peru calls urgently on States that have not yet done so to accept the Court's compulsory jurisdiction over contentious issues and encourages the Secretary-General to pursue his efforts to promote this cause.

We reiterate our full support for the work of the Court in its adjudicating and consulting roles, and highlight the high-profile work of its judges as first-rate legal officials whose effective management has enabled the Court to fulfil its mandate as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations system. It behoves Member States to ensure that the Court enjoys the resources adequate to performing its work. In that regard, we believe that the positive response to the request mentioned in paragraph 24 of the report for an associate legal officer within the Department of Legal Matters would strengthen the Court's ability to manage its workload. In that context, we note with concern the observations made by the President of the Court in his explanatory memorandum (A/66/726, annex), in which he refers to the need for the correct balance to be struck in order to ensure that budgetary limitations in no way impair the Court's important work.

Mr. Schaper (Netherlands), Vice-President, took the Chair.

Lastly, Peru wishes to point out that recourse to the International Court of Justice is a commitment to peace whereby States emphatically reaffirm their commitment to the rule of law and the well-being of their peoples, fully consistent with the principles and purposes enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

Mr. Song (Singapore): My delegation would like to express its thanks to the International Court of Justice for the comprehensive and informative report on its work from 1 August 2011 to 31 July 2012 (A/67/4). It is evident that the Court has had an extremely busy year dealing with a myriad of legal issues. It is therefore a testament to the leadership of President Peter Tomka and former President Hisashi Owada that the Court has been able to discharge its duties with the highest level of competence, efficiency and professionalism.

It is Singapore's firmly held view that international relations must be governed by the rule of law in order to preserve international peace and stability. Fundamental to the rule of law is the notion that disputes must be resolved by peaceful means. Where disputes fail to be resolved through informal processes such as negotiations or mediation, serious consideration should be given to having them adjudicated by a neutral third party.

Needless to say, the Court plays a vital role in that regard. Under international law, there is no formal hierarchy among the various judicial mechanisms and international tribunals, but the Court unquestionably commands immense prestige and authority. First, it is the only international court of a universal character with general jurisdiction. Secondly, it is the principal judicial organ of the United Nations and draws on a heritage dating back to the Permanent Court of International Justice. Its judgments have been and continue to be extremely influential, and have a deep impact on the development of international law. The Court therefore plays a fundamental role in ensuring that the rule of law in international relations is maintained and strengthened.

During the period covered by the report, there were a number of jurisprudential developments of particular interest to my delegation. We note that the Court has taken the opportunity to clarify the jurisprudence relating to its jurisdiction in response to requests to adjudicate and render advisory opinions. Such clarifications are useful in this developing area of international law, and given the growing number of cases where such arguments are being made, we anticipate that in future there will be other occasions for further elaboration and development.

We also note the increasing number of disputes involving issues of environmental law being brought before the Court. We look forward to hearing the Court's views on such issues, given the dynamic growth of this area of law and their relevance to the global community.

We also keenly followed the Court's deliberations in the case concerning *Questions relating to the Obligation to Prosecute or Extradite (Belgium v. Senegal)*. The interpretation of this obligation concerns the international community as a whole, given the prevalence of such clauses in a whole range of international treaties, including those on counter-terrorism. It is no coincidence that the International Law Commission is also in the process of examining this issue and has in fact specifically noted that an in-depth analysis of the case will be conducted in order to fully assess its implications for the topic.

With regard to the Court's administration, my delegation applauds the Court for successfully clearing its backlog of cases. We share its confidence that States considering coming to the principal judicial organ of the United Nations can now be assured that as soon as the written phase of the proceedings has come to a close, the Court will be able to move to the oral proceedings in a timely manner. We are also encouraged to read that work is proceeding on modernization of the Great Hall of Justice, including the introduction of information technology resources on the judges' bench, and we look forward to its speedy completion.

Singapore notes the Court's request for the creation of an associate legal officer post (P-2) within the Department of Legal Matters in its budget submission for the biennium 2012-2013, which was not granted. My delegation's view is that the request was not made lightly, given the efforts of the Court to increase its efficiency, including holding deliberations on several cases simultaneously. Considering the central role the Court plays and the range of issues which it has to deal with, including those of a highly complex and controversial nature, it is only right that we support this request.

In conclusion, Singapore reiterates its belief that the Court plays a vital role in ensuring the existence and maintenance of the rule of law in international relations. We continue to hold the Court in highest regard and pledge our continued support for its work. We wish it every success in meeting its future challenges and in discharging its duties for the year ahead.

Mr. De Vega (Philippines): At the outset, the Philippines aligns itself with the statement made earlier by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

We thank President Peter Tomka and his team at The Hague for their comprehensive report (A/67/4) on the work of the International Court of Justice in the past year. After perusing that report, my delegation has a few recollections, reflections and hopes to express.

The first recollection is the very basis for the Court. Article 92 of the Charter of the United Nations defines the Court as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations.

The second recollection is the purpose of the Court. It resolves disputes that cannot otherwise be resolved by or through the political organs of the United Nations. In other words, it resolves legal or justiciable disputes. Under Article 38 of the Statute of the Court, those are disputes capable of settlement through the application of the sources of international law: treaty, international custom, general principles of law and, as subsidiary sources, judicial decisions and the teachings of the most highly qualified publicists.

The third recollection is the relevance of the Court. On September 24, for the first time since international law created the United Nations 67 years ago, we finally devoted a high-level meeting to the rule of law at the national and international levels (A/67/PV.3). We adopted resolution 67/1, which recognizes that, across and beyond the United Nations system, we have the institutions, the working methods and the relationships to make the rule of law relevant to peace and security, to human rights and to development.

One of those institutions is none other than the Court. In paragraph 31 of the Declaration, we recognized its positive contribution in promoting the rule of law. We also affirmed our duty to comply with its decisions in contentious cases. The Philippines approaches the rule of law at the international level from the prism of Article 1, paragraph 1 of the United Nations Charter, which lays down that one purpose of the Organization is

> "to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace".

Guided by that inspiration, the Philippines reiterates its categorical support for the President's overriding priority for his presidency, as reflected in his choice for the theme of this session. That is the very rationale for the 1982 Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes (resolution 37/10, annex), whose thirtieth anniversary we will commemorate on 15 November.

May I now share our first reflection. There is no doubt that the Court continues to play a vital role in international relations. I shall explain. The Manila Declaration was negotiated and adopted by the General Assembly during the Cold War, when non-aligned countries were seeking to consolidate their political and economic independence. The Declaration supported their aspirations by articulating the norms of the peaceful settlement of disputes as outlined in Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter. Of the eight means for the peaceful settlement of disputes outlined in part I, paragraph 5, of the Manila Declaration, judicial settlement, specifically through the Court, is the most formal and perhaps the most rules-based means. May I therefore emphasize that if a party to a dispute moves for a judicial settlement of the dispute by the Court, that is not an unfriendly act and should not be taken as such by the other party to the dispute.

Our second reflection builds on the continuing relevance of the Court. There is now a greater need for its services. Beginning with the case of *Corfu Channel (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland v. Albania)* in 1947 until the adoption in 1982 of the Manila Declaration — a span of 35 years — the Court disposed of 49 contentious cases. Since 1982, however, the caseload of the Court has increased, and it disposed of 76 contentious cases in a comparably briefer period.

This apparently increasing confidence in the capabilities, credibility and impartiality of the Court, particularly among developing countries, is not wholly unrelated to the norms, values and aspirations articulated by the Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes. After all, the Declaration reflects the international community's increasing reliance on the rule of law as a cornerstone not only of the peaceful settlement of disputes, but also of the maintenance of international peace and security.

Continuing with the arc of peace, law and justice in international relations, our third reflection is that the mandate and jurisdiction of the Court are sharper than ever before. The creation of the International Criminal Court and specialized dispute-settlement mechanisms, such as the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea and the Appellate Body of the World Trade Organization, do not make the Court any less important in the twenty-first century. On the contrary, the new international legal architecture only strengthens the Court as the only forum for resolving justiciable disputes between States concerning the vast field of general international law.

This brings us to our fourth reflection. Through the work of the Court, we appreciate even more why States choose to put a limit on their sovereignty by agreeing to customary and novel rules of international law. Quite simply, it is in our national interest to do so. International

law is even more important for developing or, if you will, less powerful countries. Only a strong rule of law at the international level can guarantee the respect, order and stability that we desire and deserve. That is how we contribute to the progressive development of international law.

If there is anything that the United Nations Charter and the Statute, jurisprudence and experience of the Court all teach us, it is that the weak, if their cause is just, should have no fear of the mighty; it is that, through the work of the Court, the rule of law in international relations has a chance to prevail; it is that, through the rule of law, we can demonstrate that right is might.

The Philippines welcomes the recent election of five new members of the Security Council. They are friends who have a strong record on peace and security, as well as the rule of law at the international level. With that development, I end my statement by expressing the hope that was expressed earlier on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. We hope that the Security Council will consider Article 96 of the Charter of the United Nations by making greater use of the Court as a source of advisory opinions and of interpretation of relevant norms of international law, particularly on the most current and controversial issues affecting international peace and security.

Mr. Nishida (Japan): At the outset, I would like to congratulate President Peter Tomka on his election as President of the International Court of Justice and to thank him for his comprehensive and detailed report (A/67/4) on the praiseworthy work of the Court over the past year. His report highlights the important role that the Court plays in inter-State conflict resolution by peaceful means. Japan would like to take this opportunity to commend the work of the Court under the leadership of President Tomka.

At no time in history has the Court occupied such a preponderant role in the international legal system as it does at this present time. Our delegation welcomes the growing trend towards a greater use of the Court by Member States in all corners of the world. The wide variety of the subject matters of the disputes referred to the International Court of Justice, from territorial and maritime boundary questions to rights of individuals, further testifies to the confidence that Member States place in the vigorous judicial work achieved by the Court.

My Government fully appreciates that the Court is also at its busiest time in its history, particularly over the last few years, and that its work schedule has reached its maximum level.

As President Tomka mentioned in his statement at the High-level Meeting on the Rule of Law at the National and International Levels, held on 24 September (see A/67/PV.3), the Court has rendered 60 judgments since 1990, as compared to the 52 delivered during its first 44 years. That achievement is all the more remarkable in the light of the fact that the Court maintained high-quality work through the judicial rigour of the members of the Court, with the support of the highly dedicated Registry. That is an element that truly places the Court as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. Japan commends the Court for continuing to make efforts to re-examine its procedures and working methods in order to conduct its activities in a sustainable manner while assuming the challenging task of warranting impartiality against political pressure and maintaining respect for equality between parties to a dispute.

As the recently held High-level Meeting made very clear, the enhancement of the rule of law has now become a common priority agenda of the international community. Indeed, again at no time in history have we heard daily of the mounting expectations across the globe for international law to serve as a device for disentangling heated controversies and difusing tensions by providing actors with a common language. My Government strongly believes that the international community must seize this moment to make international law play a more important role in international relations. The threat or use of force are prohibited under international law and should no longer be resorted to as a means to resolve conflicts. But the reality is that more needs to be done. The international community as a whole needs to recommit itself to establishing the primacy of international law, as well as to settling disputes through peaceful means, including by judicial mechanisms. Japan is committed to upholding the rule of law in international relations. As my Government has reiterated on many occasions, the universal acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction by Member States is a key step forward in enabling the enhancement of the rule of law at the international level. Japan itself has steadfastly accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court since 1958. Our delegation

calls upon all Member States that have not yet done so to accept the jurisdiction of the Court.

Finally, we cannot overemphasize the importance of strengthening the functioning of the Court. Japan will continue to contribute to the efficient and effective work of the International Court of Justice and wishes the Court every success in its endeavours.

Mr. Ragaglini (Italy): It is a privilege for me today to address the General Assembly on its consideration of the annual report of the International Court of Justice (A/67/4). I wish to congratulate Judge Peter Tomka on his election as the President of the International Court of Justice. I am certain that, under his able leadership, the world Court will continue to meet the expectations and the needs of the international community. I would also like to thank President Tomka for his comprehensive report, which illustrates very well the renewed pivotal role of the Court at the present juncture in international relations.

On 3 February, the Court issued a Judgment on a dispute between Germany and Italy relating to *Jurisdictional Immunities of the State (Germany v. Italy: Greece intervening)*. Just a few weeks after the Judgment, Italy's domestic courts provided for its implementation in accordance with Article 94 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice. Currently, the adoption of specific legislation to further strengthen compliance with the Court's Judgment is under way. The prompt response both by the judiciary and the Government and Parliament of Italy shows the strong commitment of the entire Italian legal system to the rule of law.

On a more general note, President Jeremić has chosen "Bringing about adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations by peaceful means" as the theme for the sixty-seventh session of the General Assembly. We think that the choice is very appropriate.

States have an obligation under the Charter of the United Nations to settle their disputes peacefully. That obligation not only entails the peaceful resolution of disputes but also indicates that international disputes must be settled. Any policy of protracted non-compliance with international law or any attempt to delay the execution of obligations flowing from international rules creates tensions and fosters unfriendly relations. In some areas, it may be to the detriment of common battles to combat crime and strengthen the rule of law.

At the opening of the sixty-seventh session of the General Assembly, on the occasion of the High-level Meeting on the Rule of Law at the National and International Levels, on 24 September (see A/67/PV.3), States made solemn pledges relating to the rule of law. In that framework, among other things, Italy announced its readiness to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under Article 36 of its Statute. Even in the absence of that declaration, Italy had already agreed to submit disputes to the Court on a number of occasions. By accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, Italy is now determined to take a further step towards strengthening the foundations for an age of accountability. It is also reaffirming its commitment to the rule of law as a pillar of its foreign policy.

The broader the acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court is, the stronger the chances are for a more just and peaceful world. Respect for international law is to be achieved in practice through compliance with the law and its enforcement.

Mr. Fife (Norway): I would like to start by thanking the International Court of Justice, the principal judicial organ of the United Nations, for its annual report (A/67/4) to the General Assembly. I would also like to express my gratitude to its President, Judge Peter Tomka, for his able presentation.

As one of the principal organs of the United Nations and the only international court of a universal character with general jurisdiction, the Court occupies a special position. It plays a significant role in the promotion of the rule of law through its judicial activities in contentious cases and through its advisory opinions. That was also duly noted at the plenary High-level Meeting on the Rule of Law at the National and International Levels, held here in New York on 24 September (see A/67/PV.3).

As noted in the report of the Court, almost as an understatement, the subject matter in the cases referred to the Court has varied widely. Moreover, those cases are growing in factual and legal complexity. Also for those reasons, the Court is particularly well placed to provide guidance, through its judicial activities, on how to counter difficulties arising from the diversification and expansion of international law, which is sometimes referred to as the fragmentation of international law. We are convinced that the cohesion of international law is actively promoted notably through a coherent

interpretation of treaties on the basis of the principles and rules contained in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The reporting period was marked by a number of significant decisions on the part of the Court. We would also like to commend the Court for the steps it has taken to enhance its efficiency and to cope with the steady increase in its workload.

We note with appreciation that it has successfully cleared its backlog of cases, as explained in the report.

It is also against that background that Norway notes that the potential for the active use of the Court as a key organ for the peaceful settlement of disputes, in conformity with the Charter, actually surpasses the number of States — 67 so far — that have made a declaration recognizing the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory. In that regard, we welcome the national debate just announced by Romania to that effect. Thus, some 300 international agreements also provide for the jurisdiction of the Court. Moreover, States may decide to agree on the referral of cases to the Court after the negotiation of special agreements, where the parties may agree on the specific issues they wish to submit to the Court.

The costs related to dispute settlement before the Court should not discourage States from submitting their disputes for settlement. States that are able to do so should therefore consider contributing to the Trust Fund to Assist States in the Settlement of Disputes through the International Court of Justice, established by the Secretary-General, from which States may apply for financial support in order to finance their dispute settlement or to comply with the Court's judgments. In that regard, I am pleased to announce that Norway has decided to contribute $80,000 to the Trust Fund and will proceed promptly with the transfer.

The International Court of Justice plays a crucial role, not only in the resolution of contentious cases and through its advisory role but also in the clarification and development of international law at large. We welcome the Court's seminal contributions in various fields, including with regard to the development of the modern law of the sea, and in particular its role in consolidating and refining principles of maritime delimitation. In doing so, the Court has provided invaluable guidance to States engaged in the negotiation of treaties on the delimitation of their continental shelves and economic zones.

We are also pleased to note that in its first delimitation judgment in the *Dispute concerning delimitation of the maritime boundary between Bangladesh and Myanmar in the Bay of Bengal (Bangladesh/Myanmar)*, delivered in March, the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea also confirmed the cohesive body of law developed by the Court, thus contributing to further consolidation and preventing the fragmentation of international law in that field. That comes in addition to similar contributions made by ad hoc arbitral tribunals established to resolve maritime delimitation issues in the recent past.

I would like to conclude by reiterating Norway's long-standing and unwavering support for the International Court of Justice as a cornerstone of the international legal order.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item for this meeting. As announced at the beginning of the meeting, we shall hear the remaining speakers at a later date to be announced.

May I take it that the General Assembly takes note of the report of the International Court of Justice (A/67/4)?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 71.

Agenda item 74

Report of the International Criminal Court

Report of the Secretary-General (A/67/378 and A/67/378/Add.1)

Note by the Secretary-General (A/67/308)

The Acting President: It is now my great honour to welcome to the United Nations His Excellency Mr. Sang-Hyun Song, President of the International Criminal Court. I now give him the floor.

Mr. Sang-Hyun Song (International Criminal Court): I am honoured to take the floor before the Assembly for the fourth time to deliver the annual report of the International Criminal Court's (ICC) to the United Nations (A/67/308).

Coming to the General Assembly on behalf of the ICC gives me the feeling of a grown-up child returning to his parental home once a year to talk about his

studies, work and life. At 10 years old, the ICC is a thriving, independent organization with broad support. It is the centrepiece of a new justice paradigm that has been joined by 121 States that have decided to bolster their national jurisdictions with an international court of last resort in order to prevent impunity for the gravest crimes known to humankind.

That achievement would not have been possible without the formative role of the United Nations and, specifically, the General Assembly, in the history of the International Criminal Court. The Assembly is where the seed of the ICC was first planted, with the adoption of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and the early work of the International Law Commission. That is where the process was revived in 1989, following the proposal by Trinidad and Tobago. It was the General Assembly that established the Preparatory Committee on the Establishment of an International Criminal Court. As the Assembly knows, the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court was adopted under the auspices of the United Nations on 17 July 1998.

On 1 July 2002, the Rome Statute entered into force. Since then, the ICC has stood on its own feet, separate from but closely connected to the United Nations through our Relationship Agreement. During its first decade, the ICC has firmly established its role in a multilateral system that aims to end impunity. I welcome the General Assembly's recognition of that role in the Declaration of the High-level Meeting of the General Assembly on the Rule of Law at the National and International Levels (resolution 67/1), held on 24 September. On behalf of the ICC, its elected officials and staff, I thank the General Assembly for all the support we have received from it.

The ICC's written report provides a comprehensive update on the Court's judicial proceedings covering the period from 1 August 2011 to 31 July 2012. Today I will only highlight the most important developments that have taken place since I last appeared before the Assembly (see A/66/PV.44).

There have been some important institutional developments. Ms. B. Fatou Bensouda was sworn in as the second Prosecutor of the ICC, six new judges were elected, and the new President of the Assembly of States Parties took office. The ICC has continued investigations in seven situations — the Democratic Republic of the Congo; Uganda; the Central African Republic; Darfur, the Sudan; Kenya; Libya; and, finally, Côte d'Ivoire. Furthermore, the ICC has been seized of an eighth situation following the Mali Government's referral to the ICC Prosecutor of the situation in Mali since January 2012 on 18 July. The Prosecutor is currently conducting a preliminary examination to determine whether the criteria for opening an investigation have been fulfilled.

Let me briefly address the state of judicial proceedings in each of the seven active situations.

The situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo was the first investigation opened by the ICC Prosecutor in 2004, following a referral by that country's Government. The ICC's first trial of Mr. Thomas Lubanga Dyilo arose from that situation. On 14 March 2012, Trial Chamber I rendered its verdict in the case, finding Mr. Lubanga guilty of the enlistment, conscription and use of children under the age of 15 to participate actively in hostilities in the Ituri district between September 2002 and August 2003. On 10 July, the Trial Chamber sentenced Mr. Lubanga to 14 years' imprisonment. On 7 August, the Chamber issued the ICC's first decision on reparations for victims, establishing principles relating to reparations and tasking the Trust Fund for Victims to collect proposals for reparations from victims. Let me stress that the verdict, sentence and reparations decision in the case of Mr. Lubanga are all under appeal and therefore not yet final.

The second trial relating to the conflict in Ituri against Mr. Katanga and Mr. Ngudjolo Chui concluded in May with closing statements. The Trial Chamber is expected to issue its judgment in the coming months.

The ICC's third case relating to Ituri is against Mr. Bosco Ntaganda, who has evaded justice for the past seven years. A second arrest warrant was issued for Mr. Ntaganda in July, expanding the allegations against him from the use of child soldiers to murder, rape, sexual slavery and other crimes.

In other developments related to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mr. Callixte Mbarushimana was released from custody on 23 December 2011, following the Pre-Trial Chamber's ruling that there was not sufficient evidence to substantiate the charges against him. In the meantime, a new arrest warrant has been issued on the basis of allegations related to the Kivus region against Mr. Sylvestre Mudacumura, who currently remains at large.

In the situation in Uganda, arrest warrants against Mr. Joseph Kony and three other alleged leaders of the Lord's Resistance Army have remained outstanding since 2005. I find that unacceptable and an affront to all those affected by the conflict in northern Uganda. Once again, I strongly urge all relevant States to cooperate in order to reach the goal of bringing those persons to justice without delay.

In the situation in the Central African Republic, the ICC's third trial, of Mr. Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo, has moved to the defence phase. The trial proceedings will continue well into next year.

In the situation in Darfur, the Sudan, one case is in the trial preparation phase — that of Mr. Banda and Mr. Jerbo, who are accused of crimes allegedly committed during an attack on African Union peacekeepers. Last week, the Trial Chamber rejected the defence request for a stay of proceedings and requested submissions on the date for the commencement of the trial. A new arrest warrant was issued in the Darfur situation on 1 March against Mr. Abdel Raheem Muhammad Hussein. Regrettably, Mr. Hussein remains at large, and arrest warrants also remain outstanding in relation to three other persons in the Darfur situation. I call upon all States to cooperate, with a view to executing those arrest warrants in order that the suspects may face the grave allegations asserted against them.

The two cases in the situation in Kenya have progressed from the pre-trial to trial phase. Of the six suspects, the Pre-Trial Chamber confirmed the charges relating to post-election violence against four of them, while releasing the two others. Two trials, each involving two accused, are set to start next April.

Significant developments have occurred in the situation in Côte d'Ivoire since I last addressed the Assembly. An arrest warrant was issued in relation to the former President of the country, Mr. Laurent Gbagbo, and he was turned over to the ICC on 30 November 2011. The case is currently in the pre-trial stage.

I now come to the situation in Libya. The two suspects subject to the ICC arrest warrants, Mr. Saif Al-Islam Al-Qadhafi and Mr. Abdullah Al-Senussi, are in the custody of Libyan authorities. An admissibility challenge made by Libya is currently pending before the Pre-Trial Chamber. In the context of the Libya situation, last summer the ICC experienced a serious crisis when four of our staff members were detained in Zintan, Libya, in the course of the exercise of their official duties. I would like to extend the ICC's sincere gratitude to the United Nations and the many Member States that helped the Court to secure the release and safe return of our colleagues.

Without the assistance of States the ICC cannot perform its mandate effectively. I fully agree with the emphasis that the Assembly's Declaration of 24 September placed on cooperation with the ICC (resolution 66/102). Cooperation is not merely a question of discharging obligations contained in the Rome Statute. The international community, including the General Assembly, has on multiple occasions declared its determination to end impunity for the gravest crimes. Cooperation with the ICC is a concrete way to give effect to that objective.

A historic first debate on the ICC's role, held in the Security Council on 17 October (see S/PV.6849), was a useful reminder of the specific challenges that cooperation poses in situations referred by the Council, namely, those of Darfur and Libya. In those situations, the ICC is exercising its mandate on behalf of the United Nations membership as a whole in that they were referred to the ICC by the Security Council on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations.

By way of resolutions adopted under Chapter VII, the Security Council has urged all States to cooperate with the ICC in the context of the Darfur and Libya situations. The question of expenses incurred by the ICC in the context of the referred situations was also discussed during the Security Council debate. In that respect, I am grateful that the General Assembly, in its resolution 66/262, of 29 May 2012, invited all States to consider making voluntary contributions towards such expenses.

The Rome Statute empowers victims in multiple ways — as participants in judicial proceedings, as recipients of reparations following a conviction and as beneficiaries of victims' assistance provided by the Trust Fund for Victims that is associated with the ICC. In that regard, the Rome Statute system has unprecedented potential to bring retributive and restorative justice closer to each other. Through its engagement in situation countries, the Trust Fund for Victims is able to give a human face to the process of international criminal justice. It has continued its important work with victims in northern Uganda and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Furthermore, it has officially notified the Pre-Trial Chamber of its

intention to undertake programmes in the Central African Republic, initially focusing on victims of sexual and gender-based violence.

The assistance that the Trust Fund for Victims is able to provide to victims depends upon voluntary donations, which are also needed to fund reparations when a convicted person is indigent. As we get closer to the implementation of the first reparations orders, the Trust Fund is in greater need of financial support than ever before. I would like to thank those States that have already generously supported the Trust Fund's important work. I call upon others to join them in doing so, for the benefit of the victims of unspeakable crimes.

The Rome Statute system has changed the way that the world looks at grave crimes under international law. With the advent of a permanent international court to prosecute such crimes, national jurisdictions have simultaneously been encouraged and empowered to prevent impunity. As the Secretary-General said in that same Security Council debate,

> "justice is crucial for breaking cycles of violence and fragility. Even the possibility of ICC engagement in a given situation can create an incentive to set up local mechanisms to deliver justice".

I suffered the horrors of war as a small child. I would not want anyone to experience what I went through in my childhood. By enforcing norms of international law and by protecting those most vulnerable, with special attention to the needs of children and women, the ICC represents a giant leap in humankind's efforts to ensure lasting peace and security for everyone.

The ICC is independent, but at the same time it is still the world's court. The community of nations created it out of the desire to protect the most fundamental values of concern to humankind as a whole. I wholeheartedly endorse the Assembly's call upon States not yet party to the Rome Statute to consider joining the ICC.

Preventing grave crimes and combating impunity is a shared interest of the entire international community. As the ICC enters its second decade, it remains firmly committed to upholding the rule of law and the principles of judicial and prosecutorial independence, guided by the Rome Statute and inspired by the common goals of humankind — values that we share with the United Nations and the Assembly.

The Acting President: The debate on this agenda item will take place on Tuesday, 6 November, following the continuation of the debate on agenda item 71.

The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 74.

Agenda item 8 (*continued*)

Organization of work, adoption of the agenda and allocation of items

Letter dated 29 October 2012 from the Chair of the Committee on Conferences addressed to the President of the General Assembly (A/67/352/Add.1)

The Acting President: Members are aware that, pursuant to section I, paragraph 7, of resolution 40/243, no subsidiary organ of the General Assembly may meet at United Nations Headquarters during a regular session of the Assembly unless explicitly authorized by the Assembly.

Authorization is thus sought for the United Nations Appeals Tribunal to hold one meeting in New York during the main part of the sixty-seventh session of the General Assembly, on the strict understanding that the meeting would be allocated conference services on an as-available basis from within existing resources and in such a way that the work of the General Assembly and its main Committees is not impeded.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to authorize the United Nations Appeals Tribunal to meet during the main part of the sixty-seventh session of the General Assembly?

It was so decided.

Programme of work

The Acting President: I would like to inform members that the Assembly will consider agenda item 109 (b), "Election of eighteen members of the Economic and Social Council", on Thursday, 8 November. The item was previously scheduled to take place on Wednesday, 31 October.

The meeting rose at 12.30 pm.

United Nations A/67/PV.30

General Assembly
Sixty-seventh session

Official Records

30th plenary meeting
Monday, 5 November 2012, 10 a.m.
New York

President: Mr. Jeremić ..... (Serbia)

In the absence of the President, Mr. Gaspar Martins (Angola), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

Agenda item 85

Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency

Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (A/67/152)

Draft resolution (A/67/L.3)

The Acting President: Due to the extreme weather conditions experienced last week, the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency was unable to travel to New York to introduce the report of the Agency for the year 2011. His prepared statement will subsequently be issued as a note by the Secretary-General. Copies of the prepared statement are also available here in the Hall.

I now give the floor to the representative of Canada to introduce draft resolution A/67/L.3.

Ms. Ventura (Canada): On behalf of the Canadian delegation, acting on behalf of the Chair of the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), it is my pleasure to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency". As colleagues are aware, the General Assembly considers this draft resolution annually. It derives from a requirement pursuant to the IAEA statute and the 1957 Agreement governing the relationship between the IAEA and the United Nations.

The draft resolution is the means by which the General Assembly takes note of the statement of the IAEA Director General and of the resolutions and decisions adopted by the General Conference, and recognizes the work of the Agency.

The draft text before the General Assembly was discussed in Vienna among IAEA member States, as well as during informal consultations here in New York.

It is a simple factual update of last year's text (resolution 66/7) that merely changes the relevant dates and lists the relevant resolutions and decisions adopted by the General Conference at its fifty-sixth plenary meeting.

It is my pleasure to commend this text for consideration by the General Assembly. We sincerely hope that it will attract consensus again this year.

The Acting President: I now give the floor to the observer of the European Union.

Mr. Mayr-Harting (European Union): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU). The acceding country Croatia; the candidate countries the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Iceland and Serbia; the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; the European Free Trade Area countries Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area; as

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

12-57291 (E)

Please recycle

well as Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova, align themselves with this statement.

We are pleased to support the draft resolution entitled "Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency" (IAEA), a report that again reaffirms the indispensable role of the Agency with regard to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and in assisting the development and practical application of atomic energy for peaceful uses, as well as in technology transfer and in nuclear verification, safety and security.

The European Union remains committed to effective multilateral action against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and emphasizes the importance of universalizing the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We call on States that have not done so to join the Treaty as non-nuclear-weapon States. The EU welcomed the consensus reached on the Action Plan at the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The Action Plan, as well as the agreement on a process for the implementation of the 1995 NPT resolution on the Middle East, including a conference on a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East to be convened in 2012, demonstrated our common resolve not only to uphold but also to strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime. In that respect, the EU commends the Facilitator, His Excellency Mr. Jaakko Laajava, for the professional work and consultations carried out, as well as for his report on the preparation of a 2012 conference on a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East presented during the NPT Preparatory Committee meeting held earlier this year in Vienna.

The European Union recalls the IAEA forum held in November 2011 on that issue and welcomes the Agency's support for the implementation of the 1995 resolution, including through the preparation of background documentation for the 2012 conference regarding modalities for a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems, as requested by the 2010 NPT Review Conference Action Plan. In that regard, with a view to contributing to those international efforts, the European Union is pleased to reaffirm its support for a process leading to the establishment of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, as demonstrated by the recent adoption, on 23 July, of a new EU Council decision. As announced at this year's NPT Preparatory Committee, the EU is pleased to announce that a track 2 seminar by the EU Non-Proliferation Consortium is taking place in Brussels today and tomorrow and is expected to allow for an open exchange of views on all aspects related to the creation of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

The 2010 NPT Review Conference reaffirmed the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in verifying and ensuring compliance by States with their safeguards obligations, with a view to preventing the diversion of nuclear material from peaceful uses. The European Union remains deeply concerned by the protracted and serious challenges to the non-proliferation regime posed by the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Syrian Arab Republic, concerns reinforced by the recent reports of the Director General of the IAEA to the Board of Governors. Once again, the Board felt it necessary to adopt a resolution on Iran reaffirming the requirements of its 2011 resolution and urging Iran to comply fully and without delay with all its obligations under the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, as well as to meet the requirements of the Board of Governors, including the application of modified Code 3.1 and the implementation and prompt entry into force of the Additional Protocol, The European Union fully supported the adoption of that resolution.

The European Union would like to stress again that the Security Council, as the final arbiter of international peace and security, has the mandate to take appropriate action in the event of non-compliance with NPT obligations, including safeguards agreements. The Agency's system of safeguards is a fundamental component of the nuclear non-proliferation regime and plays an indispensable role in the implementation of the NPT. In that respect, the European Union would like to express its satisfaction that the IAEA General Conference adopted by an overwhelming majority a resolution entitled "Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of the safeguards system and the application of the Model Additional Protocol". The European Union is grateful for the wide support received from the IAEA member States for what is traditionally an EU-sponsored resolution. The EU reiterates its view that the measures contained in the model additional protocol form an integral part of the IAEA safeguards system, and that comprehensive safeguards agreements, together with additional protocols, constitute the current IAEA verification standard. The European Union calls for the universalization of those two

essential instruments of the IAEA safeguards system without delay.

With regard to nuclear safety, in particular with regard to the EU responses to the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear accident, I would like to mention that, on 25 March 2011, the European Council called for comprehensive risk and safety assessments — stress tests — to be conducted at European nuclear power plants. The 17 national reports — from 15 EU countries, Switzerland and Ukraine — covering all nuclear power plants of the EU and of participating countries have been assessed by 80 reviewers from Europe. Many observers from third countries also took part in that unprecedented initiative. The peer-reviewed report was transmitted to the June 2012 European Council meeting. In July, an action plan was agreed upon in order to follow the implementation of the recommendations of the report. As requested by the European Council in March 2011, the European Commission will now examine possible evolutions of European legislation, notably of the nuclear safety directive, and submit them to Member States.

The EU attaches the utmost importance to the implementation of the highest standards of nuclear safety worldwide. International cooperation is crucial to promoting the global nuclear safety framework. In that context, the Convention on Nuclear Safety, the Convention on Assistance in Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency, the Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident and the Joint Convention are instruments of major importance. The European Union calls on all Member States that have not yet done so to become contracting parties to the relevant safety Conventions without delay. The IAEA Action Plan on Nuclear Safety is also an important instrument that should be implemented by Member States and the Secretariat.

We face a new era of threats from non-State actors, particularly terrorists, who seek to acquire weapons of mass destruction and related technology and materials and present one of the potentially most destructive risks to global security. In the light of such ongoing threats, the EU actively supports Security Council resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1887 (2009), as well as a number of other international initiatives, such as the Group of Eight Global Partnership against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction, the Proliferation Security Initiative, the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, the Nuclear Security Summits and the Global Threat Reduction Initiative. The EU looks forward to the Agency's July 2013 International Conference on Nuclear Security: Enhancing Global Efforts, which is open to all States, and welcomes the role that international processes and initiatives can play in facilitating synergy and cooperation in the area of nuclear security.

The EU supports IAEA activities in the areas of nuclear security in the framework of the implementation of the EU's strategy against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The EU, together with individual member States, is one of the main contributors to the Nuclear Security Fund, having provided around €30 million to date. So far, more than 50 countries have benefited from assistance funded through EU joint actions and Council decisions. That number continues to grow.

During the period 2007-2013, under the EU Instrument for Stability, nearly €260 million has been dedicated to chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) risk mitigation worldwide. Of that amount, more than €100 million has been allocated to the EU's regional CBRN centres of excellence initiative. The objective of the centres of excellence is to invest in strengthening the institutional capacity of stakeholders in partner countries to mitigate chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear risks, irrespective of their origin. At the same time, the European Union has stepped up its outreach and coordination efforts to key partners and international organizations. On 19 April, the Security Council welcomed the establishment of the CBRN centres of excellence (see S/PV.6752); a major conference on the centres was held at the United Nations in New York on 22 June; and EU services are about to finalize a broad understanding on coordination with the IAEA's Office of Nuclear Security that will include regular work on a strategic and technical level on the radiological and nuclear aspects of the CBRN centres of excellence initiative.

Effective physical protection is of the utmost importance in order to prevent nuclear material falling into the hands of terrorists or being accidentally misused, as well as to protect nuclear facilities against unauthorized use and malicious acts. The EU therefore urges all States that have not yet done so to become party to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and its 2005 amendment.

Finally, the European Union uses several of its financial instruments to support both the IAEA and

cooperation with third countries in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and technology, amounting to a total of some €150 million per year. Where the peaceful uses of nuclear energy are concerned, the Agency plays an important role in the areas of human health, food and agriculture, water resources, the environment and nuclear energy, as well as in nuclear and radiation safety, in participating Member States. Part of the EU's funding through its financial instruments is implemented in third countries through the IAEA's Technical Cooperation Fund, to which the EU and its member States are among the largest contributors. We also make substantial contributions to the Agency's Peaceful Uses Initiative. On 4 May, on the margins of the meetings of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 Review of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the EU organized a side event on the topic of peaceful uses, with the participation of the Agency.

Mr. Ferguson (Australia): Australia commends Director General Amano for his report (A/67/152) on the achievements of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and on the challenges it will face over the coming years.

As a member of the IAEA Board of Governors, Australia takes very seriously the responsibilities that entails. We attach great importance to the central role played by the IAEA in improving the safety and security of nuclear activities, enlarging the humanitarian contribution made by nuclear technology and verifying States' non-proliferation commitments.

In the post-Fukushima accident era, Director General Amano's ongoing actions and initiatives have improved international nuclear safety, particularly through the implementation of the IAEA Action Plan on Nuclear Safety. The Action Plan is a strong and practical demonstration of the priority the international community attaches to achieving the highest possible standards in nuclear safety. We encourage States to be proactive in undertaking the actions outlined in the Plan, and any additional actions that are relevant to their own circumstances.

Australia welcomes the positive outcomes of the second Extraordinary Meeting of Parties to the Convention on Nuclear Safety, held in August, especially the upgrading of the rules and guidelines that will strengthen nuclear safety through more comprehensive national reporting and robust peer-review processes.

While important, safety measures are not the only elements required to properly protect people and the environment. The IAEA's nuclear security programme and its role in international nuclear security initiatives and activities are equally important. The IAEA safeguards system is one of the central pillars of the nuclear non-proliferation regime. To be completely effective, the IAEA's safeguards system must have universal coverage. The universalization of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is indispensable to the system. We continue to call on those States that have not signed and ratified the Treaty to do so as soon as possible, and to place their nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. We continue to call on all those States party to the NPT that have yet to fulfil their relevant obligations under the Treaty to conclude comprehensive safeguards agreements and to adhere to the Additional Protocols without delay.

States must comply with their safeguards obligations. IAEA safeguards obligations are not voluntary. It is therefore a matter of deep concern that certain States continue to be in breach of their obligations. We call on those countries to engage with the Agency to resolve all issues, demonstrate conclusively the peaceful intent of their nuclear activities, and comply fully with all of their international obligations, including addressing the concerns of the international community. Australia commends the Agency for its continuing efforts to resolve those issues.

Australia continues to support the Agency in developing safeguards techniques and approaches. Recently, the University of Western Australia became the newest member of the Agency's network of analytical laboratories. In that role, it will analyse environmental samples with the ability to detect illicit nuclear activities.

Australia is committed to working closely with the Agency and our neighbours in the Asia Pacific region on peaceful applications of nuclear energy. Australia shares its skilled scientific research base, equipment and personnel with regional neighbours and other Member States, and we provide strong support to the Agency's technical cooperation programme.

The Agency plays a vital role in enhancing States' capacities to prevent, diagnose and treat health problems through the use of nuclear techniques. We should never lose sight of such humanitarian benefits, to which the IAEA is uniquely able to provide worldwide support.

Australia has recently announced an expansion of its nuclear medicine production capability, which in coming years will be able to supply a large part of global need for medical radioisotopes. It is crucial that we advance both health outcomes from nuclear medicine and global nuclear non-proliferation efforts by minimizing the civilian use of highly enriched uranium. Our new facility is based solely on the use of low-enriched uranium. Australia is also further developing its specialized nuclear waste management technology, Synroc, to encapsulate and store safely the waste from its expanded nuclear medicine production.

Finally, the external environment in which the Agency operates is highly fluid, and we must ensure that the Agency has the capability to respond quickly and effectively to external developments, be they related to nuclear safety, physical protection, nuclear proliferation or sustainable development. Australia will continue to provide the technical, financial and political support to ensure that the Agency can help States meet the challenges of today and tomorrow.

Australia is pleased to sponsor draft resolution A/67/L.3 on the report of the IAEA.

Ms. Tandon (India): My delegation thanks the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for preparing the annual report for the year 2011, as transmitted in the note by the Secretary-General (A/67/152).

The increasing global demand for energy, as well as concerns about climate change, volatile fossil fuel prices and the security of energy supplies, remain essential factors in deciding an energy mix for any country. This is aptly reflected by the observation in the report that, despite the nuclear accident in Japan in March 2011, nuclear power remains an important option not only for countries with existing nuclear programmes, but also for developing countries with growing energy requirements. We note that the IAEA's post-accident projections of global nuclear power capacity in 2030 are slightly lower than previously projected, as some countries have deferred their decisions to introduce nuclear programmes.

The Fukushima accident elicited a global response to the issue of enhancing nuclear safety, with Member States reassessing the safety of existing nuclear power plants. While the results of these reassessments will be further refined as necessary in the light of new information that might emerge in the future, it is a matter of satisfaction that the data collected by the IAEA and the World Association of Nuclear Operators shows that in 2011 the level of nuclear safety among the 435 operating nuclear power plants in operation around the world remained high.

However, as Fukushima has demonstrated, there is no room for complacency. The IAEA should also take all necessary measures to allay misapprehension among the public and member States about the safety of nuclear power plants, taking into account the current advances in relevant design and technology areas. Therefore, we would like to call on all stakeholders to work collectively to continue to enhance nuclear safety. In this context, we would like to encourage the IAEA to make concerted efforts to enable the free flow of the latest information, technology and equipment pertaining to nuclear safety among member States.

Nuclear energy has a crucial role to play in achieving the objectives of India's sustainable economic growth. At the same time, India is extensively engaged in the development of nuclear technologies in diverse fields extending beyond nuclear power. These include applications for improved crop varieties, crop protection and radiation-based post-harvest technologies, radiodiagnosis and radiotherapy for diseases, and technologies for safe drinking water, among others.

The nuclear power programme in India is oriented towards maximizing the energy potential of available uranium resources and the utilization of its large thorium reserves. We believe that available global uranium resources cannot sustain the projected expansion of nuclear power without adopting a closed fuel cycle approach and subsequently adopting a thorium fuel cycle.

In this context, we would like to mention the IAEA technical meeting held in India in October 2011, where over 50 experts from 20 member States deliberated on diverse subjects related to thorium. The participants noted thorium's promise in extending the global deployment of nuclear power, and concluded that the technology is sufficiently mature for an initial commercial deployment. We encourage the IAEA to further engage in the thorium fuel cycle. With its excellent physical and nuclear properties, thorium is widely and rightly viewed as the fuel of the future.

Currently, India has 20 operating reactors with an installed capacity of 4,780 megawatts, and seven reactors under construction with an installed

capacity of 5,300 megawatts. The first unit of the 1,000-megawatt electrical pressurized heavy-water reactor at Kudankulam is due to attain first criticality very shortly. The second unit is to follow soon after. Work is proceeding on four nuclear power plants of indigenous design of 700-megawatt electrical pressurized heavy-water reactor type, two each at Rawatbhata, in Rajasthan, and Kakrapar, in Gujarat. The prototype fast breeder reactor of 500 megawatts is also in an advanced stage of construction. A number of other reactor projects are under negotiation with prospective foreign vendors for the setting up of nuclear power plants at different sites.

We were happy to welcome three new members into the fold of the International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles (INPRO) in 2011. India has been associated with INPRO since its inception, and has contributed to its progress. We believe that this programme has great potential for making nuclear energy accessible in a safe and sustainable manner, particularly to new entrants embarking on this path. The IAEA, through INPRO, should continue to play a central role in developing innovative technology for the safe utilization of nuclear power.

My delegation fully supports other activities of the IAEA undertaken to stimulate innovation in nuclear power through technical working groups for different reactor technologies, small and medium-sized reactors, and non-electrical applications. The coordinated research projects organized by the IAEA provide an excellent forum for understanding and developing technology.

India attaches great importance to the IAEA's work in the field of nuclear science. We contribute to these activities through participation in the technical meetings and coordinated research projects and support the IAEA's programme in nuclear fusion.

My delegation believes that the IAEA's programmes and achievements in nuclear applications in food and agriculture, human health and nutrition, water resources management, protection of the environment and industry go a long way towards meeting the needs of developing countries. We will continue to provide our support to these IAEA programmes, including by offering experts' services and seats in reputed institutions for training fellows from member States.

With these comments, we take note of the IAEA's annual report for 2011. India supports the work of the IAEA and has sponsored draft resolution A/67/L.3 on the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Mr. Lazarev (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): On behalf of the delegation of the Republic of Belarus, allow me to express our appreciation for the report of the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Mr. Yukiya Amano, on the activities of the Agency over the past year (see A/67/152). The Belarusian delegation reiterates its support for the Agency as the leading international organization contributing to the safe, reliable and peaceful use of nuclear energy for the purposes of sustainable development.

The past year has been difficult for the entire international nuclear community, in particular the IAEA, in the light of the accident at the Fukushima nuclear power plant in Japan. A quarter of a century after the Chernobyl disaster, the world was again confronted by a nuclear accident. That has forced us to reassess the issue of nuclear safety and of how to ensure it.

We note the great amount of work undertaken by the Agency's secretariat, in cooperation with member States, to adapt current approaches to ensuring a global nuclear safety regime. Belarus has taken an active part in that process and intends to make its own contribution towards implementing the IAEA Action Plan on Nuclear Safety, endorsed at the fifty-fifth regular session of the General Conference in September 2011.

Belarus attaches the utmost importance to ensuring nuclear and radiation safety in the implementation of its national nuclear power programme. The safety of such future programmes is a State priority and our country undertakes all the necessary phases of developing nuclear energy in close cooperation with the Agency and in strict compliance with its norms and standards. That was reaffirmed by the successful hosting of the Integrated Nuclear Infrastructure Review mission in Belarus in June. The efforts of Belarus were highly commended during visits to that country by the Agency's Director General, Yukiya Amano, in April and by its Deputy Director General, Alexander Bychkov, in October.

We note the fruitful cooperation with the Agency's Secretariat on strengthening nuclear security. With IAEA assistance, Belarus is implementing a relevant and coordinated plan of action. We believe such activities to be a significant contribution of Belarus

towards bolstering nuclear security not only nationally but also regionally.

Belarus is firmly convinced of the importance of the IAEA's coordinating role in the global efforts to strengthen nuclear security and to prevent nuclear terrorism. Only the agreed and joint actions of the international community in that area can produce tangible results. In that regard, we attach great significance to the implementation of and broader participation by States in the international legal instruments adopted under the auspices of the Agency, including the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material.

Belarus actively participates in the Agency's Technical Cooperation Programme, through which provision is made for considerable assistance in applying nuclear knowledge and technology. The main national priorities are the development of the nuclear power infrastructure, environmental protection, the rehabilitation of territories that suffered as a result of the Chernobyl disaster and health issues. We believe that maintaining and bolstering the Technical Cooperation Programme, as well as ensuring its robust financial support, must remain a priority among the IAEA activities. As a firm and steadfast champion of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, Belarus strictly complies with its obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its safeguards agreement. We deem it very important to strengthen the IAEA safeguards system, including the additional protocol, as the standard for verification activity.

In conclusion, we would like to reiterate our support for the Agency's work. We note that Belarus is a sponsor of draft resolution A/67/L.3, which has been submitted for the consideration of the General Assembly.

Mr. Wang Min (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation welcomes the report of Mr. Yukiya Amano, Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, on the work of the Agency (see A/67/152).

Over the past year, the IAEA has conscientiously performed its duties in accordance with its statutory mandate by maintaining a balanced development of its two major mandates of promoting the peaceful use of nuclear energy and of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and has achieved fruitful results in various areas of its work. In the field of nuclear safety in particular, the Agency has taken a series of measures to ensure the comprehensive and effective implementation of the Action Plan on Nuclear Safety since its adoption at the fifty-fifth regular session of the General Conference of the IAEA. China believes that such efforts by the Agency are of great importance to restoring public confidence in nuclear energy, to improving international nuclear safety and emergency response and to ensuring the safe and sustainable development of global nuclear energy.

At the same time, through its Technical Cooperation Programme, the Agency has promoted the application of nuclear technology in a broad range of areas, such as public health, medical services, agriculture and environmental protection. On the basis of the Programme, the Agency has provided important guidance to developing countries on developing nuclear energy. It has also supported and assisted member States in strengthening their nuclear security and safety capabilities by establishing the Nuclear Security Guidance Committee and by drawing up guiding documents, such as the Nuclear Security Fundamentals. The Agency continuously strives to promote the universality of the comprehensive safeguards agreement and its additional protocol, and has resolutely carried out its safeguards functions. The Chinese delegation is glad to see that the Agency's work has been widely recognized and supported by member States.

The Fukushima nuclear accident triggered deep reflection within the international community on the use of nuclear energy, and countries increasingly have a sound understanding of nuclear power development. On the one hand, nuclear power, as a clean and efficient form of energy, still plays an irreplaceable role in safeguarding energy security, in promoting economic development and in combating climate change. The global trend for nuclear power development has essentially remained the same. On the other hand, safety is a priority for and fundamental to developing nuclear energy.

China always adheres to the principle of safety first in developing nuclear energy. We have established a comprehensive system of legal standards and a regulatory framework for nuclear safety, and will continue to improve such structures. We have enhanced the management of our nuclear safety and emergency response, stepped up efforts in staff training and technology research and development and have a good track record in nuclear safety. China has endorsed

and actively participated in relevant international and regional exchanges and cooperation in order to further improve nuclear safety. To that end, it has also worked tirelessly to develop and to implement advanced nuclear energy technology.

China also attaches great importance to nuclear security capacity-building and supports and actively participates in relevant international cooperation. In March 2012, President Hu Jintao attended the Nuclear Security Summit in Seoul, where he expounded on China's policy and measures on nuclear security issues in a comprehensive manner. China played a constructive role in ensuring the success of the Summit and made a great contribution to promoting international cooperation on nuclear security.

At present, the construction of the centre of excellence on nuclear security in China, in cooperation with relevant countries, is proceeding in an orderly fashion. China will strive to make it a regional centre of excellence, and cooperate and interconnect with other centres to raise the level of nuclear security in the region. In addition, China supports the leading role of the International Atomic Energy Agency in the field of nuclear security, and will continue to offer contributions to the Nuclear Security Fund.

The Agency is the most authoritative and representative international organization in the nuclear field. Member States have high expectations for it. It is China's hope that, facing the new situation, the Agency will give priority, first, to further promoting the implementation of the Action Plan on Nuclear Safety and international exchanges and cooperation on nuclear safety, and to helping member States enhance nuclear safety and emergency response capabilities; secondly, to further improving the standards and guidelines in nuclear security and assisting Member States in upgrading their national nuclear security system with a view to playing a more important role in enhancing nuclear security at the global level; thirdly, to strengthening the safeguards regime and effectively preventing nuclear proliferation; and, fourthly, to maintaining an objective and impartial stand on sensitive and controversial nuclear issues, and playing a constructive role in peacefully resolving those issues through dialogue and cooperation.

Mr. León González (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba welcomes and supports the important role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The application of nuclear technologies in such priority areas as health, food security, environmental protection and the management of water resources is an important contribution to improving life on our planet. Cuba attaches particular importance to the technical cooperation activity of the Agency because it is an essential way to promote nuclear technology in developing countries. Among other aspects, that can be seen in the strict fulfilment of our obligations to the IAEA Technical Cooperation Programme. In 2011, Cuba fulfilled on time its financial commitments to the Technical Cooperation Fund and paid 100 per cent of its expenses for its national participation, achieving a 92 per cent implementation rate for national projects, which is a figure higher than average.

In the case of Cuba, IAEA technical cooperation projects fit harmoniously with our development programmes, which guarantees their impact and continuity. Cuba continues to increase its contributions to the IAEA Technical Cooperation Programme through various actions, among which I note the contribution of 44 experts who have participated in 70 missions, and the organization of 20 courses and/or regional training workshops.

Cuba also considers it vitally important to continue cooperation between developing countries. That is why we reiterate our support of the Regional Cooperative Arrangements for the Promotion of Nuclear Science and Technology in Latin America, an essential mechanism for promoting nuclear cooperation among the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean. We welcome the measures that have been taken to strengthen that programme, both by participating countries and by the IAEA itself. Cuba is playing an active role in that process.

The economic trade and financial embargo applied by the United States of America to Cuba for more than 50 years affects the activities of the IAEA in our country and violates the statutes of that body. Because of the blockade, the IAEA has had problems purchasing specialized equipment for projects in Cuba, since North American companies or those that provide training to Cubans are not allowed to sell their equipment for use in Cuba because of the sanctions. Furthermore, it is difficult for Cuban nationals to participate in training courses organized in the United States, which also affects the implementation of projects linked to the fight against cancer, which is an IAEA priority. Once again, I denounce the unjust and criminal blockade. Cuba recognizes, however, the ongoing efforts of the

IAEA secretariat to find alternatives or solutions to that problem.

My country appreciates the work of the Organization in the area of nuclear safety, and stresses the fundamental responsibility of States in that area. In March, Cuba and the IAEA signed an integrated support plan for physical nuclear safety, the implementation of which is advancing satisfactorily. We welcome the excellent level of cooperation that has been achieved with the IAEA Department of Nuclear Safety and Security in the implementation of projects to improve physical nuclear safety in border control and installations with Category 1 and 2 radioactive sources. Cuba has also hosted regional training events, an area of IAEA support that we consider to be fundamental.

My country also welcomes the preparations being carried out by the International Atomic Energy Agency to host the important international conference on nuclear security that will take place in Vienna from 1 to 5 July 2013, with the participation of all member States. In that context, I would like to inform the Assembly that Cuba is at an advanced stage of the constitutional process of ratifying the Amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material. We reaffirm the need to strengthen the nuclear security regime at the international level, and stress that this is the primary responsibility of States with nuclear installations. Moreover, we recognize the IAEA's central role in promoting and coordinating international efforts and cooperation to strengthen nuclear security at the global level.

Cuba is part of the small group of countries that have met their commitments in the area of safeguards, as certified by the IAEA, which confirms that we are a country that does not have undeclared nuclear material or engage in undeclared nuclear activities. We attach great importance to the sensitive issue of safeguards and to the impartial and professional conduct of the IAEA secretariat in the activities undertaken in that area. We have repeatedly criticized the manipulation and politicization of the Agency for political purposes, as well as the double standards that unfortunately prevail in its analyses. Activities in that area are the exclusive competence of the IAEA, and we therefore reiterate our rejection of the decisions that have involved the Security Council in their consideration.

Cuba reaffirms that verification activities must first and foremost respect the sovereignty and national interests of member States. We call on the IAEA secretariat to continue to work to provide a climate of impartiality, trust, understanding and transparency, based on objectivity and truth, which will help resolve the specific issues of compliance with safeguards agreements being considered by the Board of Governors and/or the General Conference of the IAEA. In that regard, we reaffirm the need to respect the inalienable right of all States to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

We once again affirm our support for the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula and for a negotiated solution to the issue on the part of all those involved. We are firmly convinced that only through diplomacy and dialogue through peaceful means will it be possible to achieve a long-term solution to the nuclear issue on the peninsula.

We would also reiterate our support for the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons in the Middle East. That would be an important contribution to achieving the goal of nuclear disarmament and a major step forward in the peace process in the region. In order to bring that about, Israel should join the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons without further delay or conditions and submit its nuclear installations to the broad safeguards of the IAEA. Cuba hopes that the conference on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East will be held with success in 2012 with the participation of all States of the region.

While we support the important role played by the IAEA and its links with the United Nations system, in particular with the disarmament machinery, we would take this opportunity to reiterate that our joint efforts must be to continue to defend nuclear disarmament as the highest priority owing to the serious threat to international peace and security and the survival of the human race posed by the existence of more than 20,000 nuclear warheads and military doctrines and strategies that perpetuate their possession and use.

Finally, we wish to emphasize that nuclear disarmament cannot be a goal that is postponed or subject to conditions. Cuba will stand firm in the battle for a better world free of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Kodama (Japan): One and a half years after the Great East Japan Earthquake and its resulting tsunamis and the accident at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station of the Tokyo Electric Power Company,

Japan is continuing its efforts, including those directed towards decontaminating and restoring the stricken areas. We once again express our gratitude for the great support and assistance that we have received from the international community to date.

I take the opportunity afforded by today's debate to talk about some of the major steps we have taken to contribute to progress in the Nuclear Safety Action Plan of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) over the past year. That issue is of particular importance to Japan, as my country is organizing the Fukushima Ministerial Conference on Nuclear Safety next December, in co-sponsorship with the IAEA. We find it important to urge the international community to implement the Action Plan and to share lessons learned and knowledge derived from the accident.

First of all, in order to strengthen international nuclear safety, we have fully imparted information and knowledge about the accident with the international community. Japan has already presented two detailed reports to the IAEA on the course of events.

Secondly, Japan decided to strengthen its national nuclear regulatory body. A new regulatory body, the Nuclear Regulation Authority, was established in order to separate the authority to regulate nuclear energy from that of promoting it, and to ensure that the new Authority will enjoy a high degree of independence so that it can assume responsibility for all important nuclear regulatory functions — safety and security, radiation protection and, beginning in April 2013, safeguards issues, that is, each of the three "S" functions. Furthermore, Japan welcomes Director General Amano's expressed intention to prepare a comprehensive report on the Fukushima Daiichi accident, which will be finalized in 2014. Japan will actively cooperate with that effort.

In order to strengthen global nuclear security, Japan will continue to endeavour to provide assistance to developing countries through the activities of the Integrated Support Centre for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Nuclear Security, working in concert with other countries and the IAEA. Japan appreciates the IAEA's efforts aimed at promoting the entry into force of the amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material. Japan, recognizing that the amendment will bring important changes to global nuclear security, will make the necessary efforts to that end.

The IAEA is the only international organization that has expertise in all aspects of nuclear energy; its expertise is not limited to nuclear safety and security. We should not lessen our efforts aimed at supporting the IAEA as it undertakes all its roles.

Japan attaches importance to the steady implementation of the Action Plan agreed at the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, in concert with the IAEA and others. In that connection, Japan welcomes the ongoing efforts by the United States and Russia towards the control and disposal of certain weapons-grade plutonium and the implementation of the IAEA verification system. We expect similar efforts from the other nuclear-weapon States.

Years of constant effort by the international community to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the IAEA safeguards have been indispensable. Thanks to them, the number of States with additional protocols in force increased from 110 to 119 over the past year, which is progress that Japan welcomes. Accordingly, Japan will further contribute to efforts for the universalization of the additional protocol. Specifically, we will do our utmost through the joint efforts of the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative (NPDI), which is a cross-regional group that aims to promote the implementation of the consensus outcome of the 2010 Review Conference and to contribute to the steady reduction of nuclear risks. Japanese Foreign Minister Gemba co-chaired the most recent ministerial level meeting of the NPDI, which was held on 26 September at the margins of the General Assembly. As expressed in the joint ministerial statement of that meeting, the NPDI is working on the ministerial letters that will urge action on the additional protocol.

Regional nuclear issues remain the most pressing challenge for the international community. The IAEA, carrying out its mission to, inter alia, prevent the diversion to military uses of nuclear energy, has been playing important roles on those issues in the light of the nuclear non-proliferation regime.

The nuclear issue of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a threat to peace and security in East Asia and for the entire international community. Its uranium enrichment programme constitutes a clear violation of Security Council resolutions and the September 2005 Joint Statement of the Six-Party Talks. Japan supports the critical role that the IAEA continues

to play in resolving the Democratic People's Republic of Korea nuclear issue.

With regard to the Iranian nuclear issue, it is indispensable for Iran to take substantive measures to assuage the concerns of the international community and build its confidence. Japan will continue to act in concert with the international community for a peaceful and diplomatic settlement of the issue.

The IAEA, which is pivotal in the nuclear non-proliferation system, has also been working decisively for the resolution of regional nuclear issues. For instance, last November, the IAEA hosted the Forum on Experience of Possible Relevance to the Creation of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in the Middle East to contribute to confidence-building efforts by the States concerned.

The IAEA's promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy in a manner that ensures nuclear safety, security and safeguards is sure to benefit all the States Members of the United Nations. Japan attaches great importance to IAEA technical cooperation and, as part of our action in that regard, will make a contribution to the IAEA in the amount of $3.5 million in this fiscal year, in addition to the contribution made in the 2011 fiscal year, in order to ensure the success of the IAEA's Peaceful Uses Initiative. In addition, Japan will continue to contribute to the promotion of technical cooperation in areas such as radiological science.

In the light of the accident at Tokyo Electric Power Company's Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power station on 11 March 2011, the Japanese Government, with a view to realizing a society not dependent on nuclear power by the 2030s, and while constantly reviewing and re-examining policies and carefully assessing the future outlook, including the international situation regarding energy, will mobilize all possible policy resources to demonstrate to the world a model that strikes a good balance between economic growth and the shift towards green energy.

As a responsible country where this nuclear accident took place, we are taking the lessons from this accident fully into account with a view to enhancing safety in the peaceful use of nuclear energy worldwide. Japan will continue to cooperate with the international community. Japan is resolved to overcome the challenges posed by this historic accident by benefiting widely from the wisdom of the world. Japan will endeavour, through cooperation with the IAEA and other countries, to ensure the world of the highest level of safety and security in its peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and further secure confidence that there is no cause for concern regarding nuclear proliferation in or by Japan.

Ms. Hussain (Singapore): The delegation of Singapore would like to thank the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Mr Yukiya Amano, and his secretariat for the comprehensive annual report of the Agency (see A/67/152).

As the global focal point for nuclear cooperation, the IAEA makes important contributions to international peace and security through its promotion of the safe, secure and peaceful uses of nuclear science and technology, and nuclear non-proliferation. Its mission of safety and security, safeguards and verification, and science and technology constitutes a comprehensive regime. Singapore strongly supports the IAEA's important work and is pleased to co-sponsor draft resolution A/67/L.3 on the report of the IAEA.

The Fukushima Daiichi nuclear accident in March 2011 was a wake-up call against complacency with regard to the safe operation of nuclear power plants and the effective regulation of the nuclear industry. It was a painful reminder that safety can never be taken for granted. In the aftermath of the accident, in September 2011 IAEA member States adopted the IAEA Action Plan on Nuclear Safety, which is now being implemented.

Progress has been made in many areas, and we commend the efforts of the secretariat to oversee the implementation of the Action Plan in the 12 key areas to enhance the global nuclear safety framework. However, much more work remains to be done. The full and effective implementation of the Action Plan will require the cooperation and commitment of all member States, the secretariat and other relevant stakeholders. In this regard, we look forward to a meaningful and constructive outcome at the upcoming Fukushima Ministerial Conference on Nuclear Safety, to be held in December 2012.

At the same time, while the primary responsibility for nuclear safety rests with individual States, the far-reaching and potentially devastating transboundary impact of a nuclear accident means that ensuring and strengthening the safety standards of nuclear facilities are of concern to the international community as a whole, and in particular the IAEA. Proposals to enhance

the effectiveness of the Convention on Nuclear Safety were also discussed during the Second Extraordinary Meeting of Contracting Parties to the Convention, held in Vienna in August. We welcome efforts that would strengthen the Convention.

We also encourage the IAEA to step up its capacity-building cooperation with regional organizations to promote and uphold the IAEA standards of safety and security in the development of nuclear energy for peaceful uses. This would help to enhance and strengthen nuclear safety in the world. In this regard, we are pleased to report that good progress has been made on the Network of Nuclear Regulatory Bodies or Relevant Authorities of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), an initiative of Thailand, to establish a network of nuclear regulatory bodies among South-East Asian countries, and to enhance regional cooperation on nuclear safety, security and safeguards matters, including emergency preparedness and response and environmental radiation monitoring. We look forward to close collaborations between the ASEAN nuclear regulatory network and the IAEA and international partners.

Nuclear non-proliferation remains a core aspect of the IAEA's mission. Singapore firmly believes that all States have the right to develop and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. At the same time, the IAEA has the vital task of ensuring that nuclear material and technology meant for peaceful purposes are not diverted for non-civilian uses that could threaten regional and international peace and stability. The IAEA's safeguards and verification regimes remain central to multilateral efforts to curb the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is therefore both in the interests and the responsibility of all States to comply with these regimes. In this connection, Singapore strongly urges all States which have not done so to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the IAEA's comprehensive safeguards agreements and additional protocols. Those States that have done so should fully implement these agreements.

The IAEA plays a central role as the global platform for strengthening nuclear security. It focuses on helping to minimize the risk of nuclear and other radioactive material falling into the hands of terrorists, or of nuclear facilities being subjected to malicious acts. In this regard, the IAEA Illicit Trafficking Database, which monitors thefts and other unauthorized activities involving nuclear and radioactive materials, is the authoritative global source of information on illicit trafficking. Singapore is pleased to announce that we joined the IAEA Illicit Trafficking Database in March.

The IAEA's work goes beyond nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear energy. The Agency makes important contributions to tackling fundamental global problems such as food security, water and energy shortages, and climate change, as well as in the area of human health. Member States must continue to support the IAEA's role in promoting the peaceful application of nuclear science and technology, such as for use in cancer treatment in developing countries.

Singapore recently completed its term as a member of the IAEA Board of Governors. We would like to reiterate our continued support for the Agency's vital role and tasks. Over the past decade, Singapore has hosted 23 scientific visits, 92 fellowship attachments and 25 regional training events with the IAEA. More recently, in June this year we hosted the Asia-Europe Meeting seminar on nuclear safety, with a specific focus on emergency preparedness and response, which is one of the key areas of focus in the Action Plan on Nuclear Safety. As part of our continued cooperation with the IAEA, Singapore will jointly host a regional workshop on notification, reporting and requesting assistance in December. In addition, we will continue to support the IAEA in promoting capacity-building, in particular among developing countries, through various technical assistance and cooperation projects.

Mr. Seger (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): Once again, the past year has been very important for the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The challenges facing the IAEA are no less important. Switzerland would like to underline three.

First, Switzerland welcomes the fact that, unlike last year, the IAEA General Conference in September adopted its traditional resolution on safeguards without opposition. However, the debate surrounding the adoption of the resolution highlighted the concerns of some member States as to the direction taken by the secretariat on the conceptual development of safeguards, namely, the "State-level concept". Switzerland fully supports efforts to enhance the effectiveness of safeguards. In this regard, we believe that increased transparency in the participation not only of the secretariat regarding the progress of its work, but also of the member States with respect to

their real concerns, could contribute to overcoming these difficulties.

Secondly, Switzerland welcomes the decision of the Second Extraordinary Meeting of Contracting Parties to the Convention on Nuclear Safety, held in August in Vienna, to establish a working group to address the strengthening of the Convention.

Switzerland will actively participate in that working group and in the ministerial conference on nuclear safety to be held in December in Fukushima. Switzerland is indeed convinced that a credible global nuclear safety regime requires the firm commitment of States to conducting periodical peer reviews and to addressing safety issues in a fully transparent manner.

Finally, Switzerland welcomes the decision of the IAEA to organize a conference on nuclear security in Vienna in July 2013. This decision will allow us to continue, in a more inclusive way, the discussions already initiated during the three most recent nuclear security summits.

Mr. Tsymbaliuk (Ukraine): The Chernobyl nuclear power plant accident in 1986 triggered not only the revision of international nuclear safety standards, but the creation of numerous international instruments to ensure both the highest level of nuclear, nuclear waste and radiation safety worldwide and a relevant system of emergency preparedness and response. In 2011, those instruments were put to the test in response to the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant accident. We believe that, given its unique expertise, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has a leading role to play in any nuclear-related accident or emergency, and that its on-site involvement is vital in addressing situations such as that at Fukushima.

While responsibility for nuclear safety rests with each member State, we believe that the IAEA safety fundamentals and requirements should constitute a minimum obligatory basis for States that have advanced civil nuclear programmes.

We believe that activities under both the Convention on Nuclear Safety and the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management enhance the safety of nuclear energy uses worldwide. We call upon all countries that have not yet done so to join these important instruments. We consider that participation in those conventions is in the best interest of any country that has or is planning its own nuclear power programme. The existing international treaty basis concerning nuclear safety and the reaction to nuclear accidents requires further improvement. The relevant work has already started in Vienna, and we believe that positive results could be achieved.

Allow me to take this opportunity to reiterate our gratitude to those countries and international organizations that continue to provide us with support and assistance in overcoming the consequences of the Chernobyl accident. I am pleased to report that, in April 2012, we reached an important milestone — the start of work on assembling the new safe confinement construction over the destroyed unit 4 of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant. This work, to be completed in 2015, will pave the way for further transformation of the shelter object into an ecologically safe system.

Nuclear security is an essential programme of the Agency. Ukraine commends the IAEA for its activities aimed at assisting States in preventing and combating nuclear terrorism. We would like to emphasize the important role of the Agency in fostering international cooperation on nuclear security, in establishing a comprehensive set of nuclear security guidelines, and in assisting member States, upon their request, to enhance their nuclear security.

Ukraine reaffirms its view that the responsibility for nuclear security rests with each individual State. All States have the responsibility to establish appropriate systems of accounting and control to take the necessary measures to prevent, detect and respond to malicious acts involving nuclear material. Ukraine supports the implementation of the IAEA Nuclear Security Plan for 2010-2013. We acknowledge the progress achieved by the Agency in improving control over radioactive sources.

Providing a contribution to the success of both the Washington, D. C., and Seoul Nuclear Security Summits, Ukraine announced and implemented in full its decision to get rid of all national stocks of highly enriched uranium. The meaning of our voluntary step is crystal clear. Ukraine remains a consistent, predictable and reliable member of the international community and makes an active contribution to combating nuclear terrorism, focusing its efforts on strengthening the physical protection of nuclear materials. In this regard, we would like to recall that, during the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly, the delegations of Ukraine, Mexico and Chile jointly declared themselves

to be countries that have voluntarily exerted efforts to minimize the use of highly enriched uranium. We call upon other Member States to follow our example and to take a practical step in support of international non-proliferation efforts.

Ukraine reaffirms the Agency's role in verifying and ensuring compliance by States with their safeguards obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Ukraine reiterates the paramount importance of IAEA safeguards in providing effective control over sensitive materials and activities. The Agency's system of safeguards is a fundamental component of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime. Measures contained in the Model Additional Protocol are an integral part of this system. The comprehensive safeguards agreement, together with the Additional Protocol, currently constitute the best verification standard.

We would like to say that we strictly fulfil our obligations under our Safeguards Agreement and the Additional Protocol. Since January 2006, Ukraine has had a comprehensive Safeguards Agreement and Additional Protocol in force. In 2010, Ukraine received positive broad conclusions from the IAEA regarding our nuclear activities. We continue to work with the Agency to establish the necessary conditions for the effective application of IAEA integrated safeguards in Ukraine.

In 2011 and 2012, the Agency continued to make significant contributions to global development objectives. We commend the Agency for its efforts, and call upon the IAEA and member States to increase further the contribution of nuclear technology to health and economic development, and to promote the dissemination of knowledge on the peaceful application of nuclear technologies among States.

Ukraine has always been a strong supporter of the IAEA Technical Cooperation Programme, which constitutes an important statutory function of the Agency. Ukraine considers the implementation of the Programme to be the cornerstone of international cooperation on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. We acknowledge the work done by the IAEA in planning and implementing technical cooperation activities that reflect the needs of different countries and regions. We believe it is important to ensure fair access to technical cooperation funds and the predictable funding of technical cooperation programmes. The key to effectiveness is to meet the needs of member States. In order to maximize the socioeconomic impact of technical cooperation projects, it is crucial that the IAEA further develop partnerships with other international organizations where appropriate.

We recognize the importance of the Agency's research activities regarding nuclear energy, particularly in the fields of safety, waste management, radiation protection, innovative reactor technologies and fuel cycles. Ukraine will continue to participate actively in the International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles. Maintaining competence and know-how across the nuclear sector is fundamental to these activities.

In conclusion, we would like to join other delegations in welcoming the IAEA report to the General Assembly at its sixty-seventh session (see A/67/152), and to express our appreciation for the work of the Agency.

Mr. De Vega (Philippines): Cognizant of the crucial role played by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) as the central multilateral forum for the promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the Philippines welcomes the report of the IAEA (see A/67/152) and lends its full support to achieving the Agency's goals and objectives.

The IAEA and its important role took centre stage last year amid concerns on nuclear safety in the aftermath of the Fukushima accident. More importantly, the nuclear accident provided opportunities for member States to consider ways to strengthen the Agency's work in nuclear safety. The Philippines welcomes the significant progress achieved in the implementation of the IAEA Action Plan on Nuclear Safety, and lauds the combined efforts of the secretariat and member States in pursuing concrete actions. These include conducting stress tests of nuclear power plants, carrying out capacity-building activities, and enhancing emergency preparedness response measures.

For our part, the Philippines is working with the IAEA secretariat in looking at the possibility of tapping our former nuclear power plant in Bataan, which we closed in 1986, to serve as a regional and international training facility on nuclear power plants.

The Philippines also welcomes the important work done by the Inter-Agency Committee on Radiological and Nuclear Emergencies this past year. We reaffirm our commitment to working with the IAEA to facilitate

improvements in nuclear and radiological incident and emergency preparedness and response systems.

Following the Fukushima accident, the Philippines conducted environmental radioactivity monitoring in nine provinces and shared the data collected with the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. The Philippines continues these monitoring activities through the regional technical cooperation project on the assessment of the environmental impact of the Fukushima accident in the Asia-Pacific region.

The Philippines also welcomes the regional initiative within the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) to establish the ASEAN Network of Regulatory Bodies on Atomic Energy, which will serve as a forum for the exchange of information on best practices among the nuclear regulatory bodies of ASEAN member States. The Network is also expected to enhance cooperation and develop national capacities in nuclear safety, security and safeguards.

Despite the Fukushima accident, countries keen to use nuclear power as a safe and clean source of energy have turned to the IAEA for technical assistance in the development or expansion of their national nuclear power programmes. In August, the Agency provided technical assistance to the Philippines in organizing a national workshop on the evaluation of alternative energy strategies and establishing a national position on nuclear power. This workshop and future related activities will aid the Philippine Government in crafting its position on nuclear power.

The Philippines believes that the IAEA continues to play an important role in helping countries achieve their Millennium Development Goals through its Technical Cooperation Programme and its various activities in nuclear applications. The Philippines especially welcomes the Director General's focus this year on nuclear applications related to food, which is of particular importance to my country, with its growing population. In June, the Philippines hosted the IAEA regional meeting on supporting climate-proof rice production systems on the basis of nuclear applications. This project not only addresses the impact of climate change on rice production, but provides an opportunity for scientific exchanges as well.

In the field of health, the Philippines continues to address the health problems caused by dengue and malaria. In that regard, we commend the work of the Insect Pest Control Laboratory of the Joint IAEA/Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in Seibersdorf, Austria, on the development of a sterile insect technique package for disease-transmitting mosquitoes. The Philippines is open to working closely with the Seibersdorf Laboratory in the future to further its work.

In the area of nuclear medicine, the IAEA's assistance allowed the Philippines to establish a technetium-99 generator facility, which makes nuclear procedures using technetium-99 now affordable to the public. Through another regional technical cooperation project, the Philippines looks forward to the establishment of a medical cyclotron facility that will supply affordable positron emission tomography radiopharmaceuticals to local hospitals.

On water resources assessment and management, the Philippines undertakes activities to develop sustainable and socially responsible water resource management plans under the IAEA Water Availability Enhancement Project. We encourage the Agency to remain involved in this area in order to assist member States in strengthening their national capacities to conduct comprehensive water resource assessments.

The Philippines reaffirms the importance of strengthening the Agency's activities in addressing the threats posed by nuclear terrorism and the illicit trafficking of nuclear and radioactive material.

Under the Philippines' national nuclear security plan, we commit to securing nuclear and radioactive materials used for peaceful purposes. We also commit to preventing the illicit trafficking of such materials. The Philippines will update this plan in coordination with the IAEA.

In January 2012, the Philippines hosted the third review meeting of the Radiological Security Partnership, which looked at the developments and challenges in subscribing to and implementing nuclear guidance documents in nuclear and radioactive security.

In partnership with the IAEA, we will host in February 2013 the International Forum on Effective Border Controls: Global Status, which will develop recommendations to strengthen border controls in combating the illicit trafficking of nuclear and radioactive materials.

With the continuing proliferation of nuclear weapons, we underscore the need to strengthen the

Agency's nuclear verification capabilities and establish confidence in the peaceful nature of nuclear activities.

Finally, the Philippines shares the vision of a world free of nuclear weapons and strongly supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones as a way to contribute to international peace and security. We remain hopeful of the convening of the 2012 conference on the Middle East, as laid out in the Final Document of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol.I)) before the end of the year.

Mr. Diallo (Senegal) (*spoke in French*): I am very happy to see you, Vice-President Gaspar Martins, presiding over this plenary meeting of the General Assembly. I take this opportunity to wish you every success in your high-level work in the Assembly's Bureau. I would also like to express my delegation's thanks to the Secretariat for the excellent analysis provided in the annual report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for 2011 (see A/67/152).

The issue of nuclear safety is once again at the heart of our concerns. Indeed, although nuclear energy is indispensable to finding new solutions for our needs through its applications in health, agriculture, the production of electricity and many other areas, its use presents real security and safety risks. That is why the IAEA verification programme remains crucial to the efforts of the international community to bring about a world free of nuclear weapons, as it limits the proliferation of such weapons.

The Agency should therefore continue, in cooperation with concerned States, to play its role in following up on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and other treaties, such as those establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones. Indeed, nuclear power cannot be developed unless the optimal conditions for safety and security are in place. Therefore, all necessary measures must be adopted in order to strengthen these elements. I reaffirm my country's commitment to the peaceful use of nuclear energy in full transparency and in a safe and sustainable manner.

With regard to technical cooperation, we are reassured by the fact that the IAEA continues to fulfil its mandate "to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world". Indeed, the peaceful applications of nuclear energy offer solutions to a series of socioeconomic and development issues that are essential to meeting the needs of humankind and thus to achieving the Millennium Development Goals. As underlined in the report, technical cooperation projects on issues as varied as nuclear-powered electricity, knowledge management, human health, the improvement of water management, more accurate determination of the sources of pollution and nuclear safety or security enable Member States to find solutions to serious development problems.

Senegal therefore recognizes and values the scientific and technical cooperation that it has with the IAEA. This rich and varied cooperation covers many areas. First, it includes support for research in the area of water resource management, agricultural productivity improvement, livestock farming development, protection from radiation and research on solutions to malnutrition.

Second is the acquisition of a gamma camera, which represents major progress in the treatment of diabetes, thyroid disease and cancer. Third is support for the fight to eliminate the tsetse fly along the Atlantic coast, north of Dakar. Fourth is cooperation with the IAEA, which has raised research facilities in Senegal to the status of world-class scientific centres. We are grateful for the support provided by the United States State Department since 2010 in the fight against the tsetse fly in West Africa. Further examples of cooperation are management training, technology transfer and exchanges of experts in the context of the various projects on which Senegal is working with the Agency. Fifth is energy production and planning and research to improve nutrition for women.

Strengthened by such fruitful experience, Senegal will spare no effort to expand its excellent cooperation with the IAEA, through an aggressive policy to promote socioeconomic development through nuclear science and technology. My delegation therefore calls for increased support for the Agency in implementing its mandate.

Mr. Haniff (Malaysia): I would like to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Amano, Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), for his circulated statement on the annual report of the Agency (see A/67/152), for the period 1 January to 31 December 2011. Malaysia also wishes to commend the Director General for his commitment to, and stewardship of, the IAEA.

At this juncture, Malaysia wishes to welcome the Republic of Fiji, the Republic of San Marino and the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago as new States members of the Agency. The latest addition has resulted in a total of 155 countries becoming States members of the Agency. That in turn has further strengthened and universalized the membership of the Agency, and has helped it to carry out its role and mandate in assisting in the development and practical application of atomic energy for peaceful uses, technology transfer to developing countries, and promoting nuclear safety, verification and security. It is indeed pleasing to note that, despite its limited resources, not only has the Agency managed to successfully carry out its work, but in fact its work has expanded in recent years.

As with other developing countries, Malaysia fully supports the peaceful use by member States of nuclear power as a source of energy. Currently, the Government of Malaysia is undertaking an in-depth study on developing a nuclear power programme in the country, including on its legal and regulatory frameworks. The overarching objective of the study is to ensure that the highest standards of nuclear safety and security are observed at all times.

Malaysia has always attached the utmost importance to nuclear safety. The Fukushima Daiichi incident has therefore weighed heavily on Malaysia's mind as it embarks on a nuclear power programme. There are certainly valuable lessons to be learned. In that regard, Malaysia welcomes the formulation and implementation of the IAEA Action Plan on Nuclear Safety, following the unprecedented Fukushima accident.

Malaysia also welcomes the report entitled "Highlights of the Lessons Learned from the IAEA Integrated Regulatory Review Service in 2006-2010", which was presented at the third Workshop on Lessons Learned from Integrated Regulatory Review Missions in October 2011. The report addresses areas that need improvement, such as the governmental, legal and regulatory frameworks, certain areas of core regulatory practices, and the efficiency and effectiveness of the missions themselves. It also provides recommendations on how countries can meet the Agency's safety requirements for national safety infrastructures. Malaysia wishes to extend our support in enhancing nuclear safety, and looks forward to participating in the Ministerial Conference on Nuclear Safety, to be held in Fukushima later this year.

For our part and in response to the Agency's request, Malaysia has hosted a number of events related to nuclear radiation, transport and waste safety. In the light of the IAEA's newly revised International Basic Safety Standards, Malaysia hosted a regional workshop on the IAEA General Safety Requirements in April 2012. We stand ready to assist in hosting similar events in the future.

Malaysia has consistently considered the issue of nuclear security to be an inseparable component of nuclear energy. To that end, we have implemented various legal mechanisms and conventions, including the Convention on Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and its 2005 Protocol, the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, the Additional Protocol to the IAEA Safeguards Agreement, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the various IAEA codes of conduct.

Malaysia appreciates the opportunity to share its knowledge on nuclear security, as well as its expertise, with a few selected member States. In that regard, Malaysia will host a regional workshop on radioactive source security for industrial radiography with various donor member States by the end of 2012. Malaysia also looks forward to discussing the possibility of Malaysia being recognized as a centre of excellence for nuclear security training in the region and beyond.

Malaysia continues to stress the importance of the Technical Cooperation Programme in promoting the peaceful use of nuclear technology. The extension of the Programme should obviously be based upon the needs and requests of member States. We believe that the programme should take into account the evolving requirements of member States, as well as the issue of funding. At the most recent meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT, some States parties called for the Technical Cooperation Programme to be supported by the regular budget instead of relying on the Technical Cooperation Fund. My delegation joins in that call, and we look forward to further discussions on the matter under the working group for financing the Agency's activities. Malaysia has indeed benefited from the Technical Cooperation Programme. At the same time, it has also contributed in-kind to the Programme, as well as provided training and sharing expertise with other member States.

As for the new project cycle for the period 2013-2014, my delegation hopes to work closely with the Agency to ensure that the projects under the Programme will be adequately funded. My delegation also appreciates the confidence that the Agency has placed in Malaysia's continuing to host the Post-Graduate Education Course in Radiation Protection, which we would execute to the best of our abilities.

Malaysia accords high importance to the peaceful uses of nuclear science and technology in agricultural, biotechnology, industrial, environmental and medical applications. In that context, Malaysia has always believed that research, development and knowledge-sharing are key to the successful and sustainable development of nuclear technology by any member State. Therefore, Malaysia attaches great importance to research and development activities within the framework of coordinated research activities, which are an important avenue for multilateral cooperation and the sharing of knowledge among scientists and engineers across the globe.

On the issue of cancer treatment and research, Malaysia is committed to further upgrading its cancer detection, monitoring and treatment systems. Malaysia recognizes and appreciates the role of the IAEA on nuclear techniques in that regard. We therefore decided to join the World Health Organization-IAEA Joint Programme of Action for Cancer Therapy by requesting an Integrated Mission for Programme of Action for Cancer Therapy to Malaysia. We wish to thank the Agency for acceding to our request.

As a State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Malaysia will continue to play a constructive role in both bilateral and multilateral cooperative arrangements in ensuring the security of nuclear materials. Malaysia commends the consensus reached in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference (see NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol.I)).

We believe that efforts to convene a conference in 2012 on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East should be supported by all. Such a conference would give momentum to the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons in the Middle East, which would undoubtedly contribute to greater peace and security in the region. Malaysia welcomes the appointment of Mr. Jaako Laajava of Finland as facilitator for the conference and wishes him success in this regard.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to reaffirm Malaysia's commitment to continuing its long-standing cooperation with the work of the Agency in fulfilling its mandate. Malaysia is confident that the Agency could play a greater role in responding to all the needs of its member States in the future if it were provided with greater resources. Nevertheless, we wish to once again express our appreciation to the Director General of the IAEA, as well as to the IAEA secretariat, for the significant and valuable work that they have carried out thus far. In this regard, Malaysia is pleased to sponsor the draft resolution on the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (A/67/L.3) at the sixty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

Mrs. Aitimova (Kazakhstan): Kazakhstan wishes to congratulate Mr. Yukiya Amano, Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), on the outstanding work of the Agency. The annual report (see A/67/152) demonstrates the shift in the nature of the Agency's functions from pure verification activities to safety and security measures for nuclear power plants, countering potential nuclear terrorism, focusing on nuclear applications and technical cooperation for a better and safer world.

As a member of the Agency, Kazakhstan is proud of its record of collaboration in seeking to apply nuclear energy, nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation at the national and Central Asian regional levels. It is clear today more than ever that it is important to bring international legal norms in line with the reality of the existence of de facto nuclear-weapon States, necessitating compliance with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) by States parties. This is to ensure improved global mechanisms for managing processes in the development of nuclear power. We therefore propose conducting, under the auspices of the IAEA, regular stress tests of nuclear plants and protection systems, as well as rapid rescue responses.

Kazakhstan is a major producer of uranium ore and has the fuel fabrication capability to further expand the peaceful uses of nuclear energy within the framework of IAEA safeguards. We collaborate with the Russian Federation in making its uranium available for enrichment at the national centre in Angarsk, Siberia, for use in nuclear power reactors. We are also working

on the Kurchatov Nuclear Technologies Park, which is under IAEA surveillance.

We support the IAEA initiative to develop a new framework for nuclear energy based on multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle that are non-political and non-discriminatory. These should be available to all safeguards-complying member States, so that no State will need to give up its rights under the NPT.

Kazakhstan has officially confirmed in writing to the Agency its readiness to host an IAEA nuclear fuel bank on two of its sites for countries unable to acquire a nuclear fuel supply on the market. As soon as the site has been determined, steps will be taken to establish the bank. The national atomic energy company, Kazatomprom, is in the process of creating a vertically integrated establishment with a complete nuclear fuel cycle meeting IAEA standards.

The Central Asian nuclear-weapon-free zone is another contribution of our efforts towards a world free from nuclear weapons, to reduce the risk of nuclear terrorism and the smuggling of nuclear weapons and radioactive materials in the region, as well as to address environmental concerns regarding ecological radiation. Kazakhstan supports the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East as a solution for peace in that region. We will work collaboratively with the Facilitator and other Member States towards that goal.

We are consistently implementing the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, as well as Security Council resolution 1540 (2004), to strengthen measures to combat illegal trafficking of nuclear and other materials. As a member of the Nuclear Suppliers Group and the Zangger Committee, Kazakhstan maintains the strictest controls over its equipment and installations that enrich uranium and reprocess spent nuclear fuel.

Last year, Kazakhstan ratified and acceded to four major nuclear security conventions, and is reviewing a draft law to accede to the Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage. We are decommissioning the BN-350 nuclear reactor and, with the support of the United States Department of Energy, implementing a project to convert the second research reactor to produce radioisotopes from low-enriched uranium. My country welcomes the proposal to strengthen the infrastructure of the IAEA Incident and Emergency Centre as the global focal point for nuclear and radiological safety or security-related incidents.

Despite being a key and responsible member of IAEA, Kazakhstan is denied the opportunity to participate in the work of elective bodies due to the existing rules of procedure. Kazakhstan fully supports the early entry into force of the amendments to article VI of the IAEA statute, and hopes that a solution will be found.

Kazakhstan's technical cooperation with IAEA from 2010 to 2015 includes nuclear education, medicine, agriculture, research reactor safety, and radioisotope and radiation applications for collective global human security. My country contributes regularly to the IAEA budget, as well as to the Technical Cooperation Fund, and stands ready to fulfil its financial obligations.

We express our gratitude to IAEA for its support to the International Day against Nuclear Tests, and in the ongoing activities of the Nuclear Discussion Forum, initiated jointly by Kazakhstan and the EastWest Institute.

To conclude, we fully support the mandate of the IAEA, and look forward to another cycle of even more productive collaboration on current and future issues in nuclear technology.

Mr. Khalil (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like at the outset to thank the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and its Director General, Mr. Yukiya Amano, for their valuable work over the past year, as reflected in the Agency's report (see A/67/152). Egypt is eager to join the list of sponsors of the annual draft resolution on the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (A/67/L.3).

I would like first to underline the contribution of nuclear technology to electric power generation. This demonstrates in turn our continued interest in the exercise of the inalienable right to the development, production and peaceful uses of nuclear energy, as enshrined in article IV of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

For almost half a century, Egypt has devoted attention to nuclear energy and its peaceful applications. Following Egypt's transition to a new democratic era resulting from the revolution of 25 January 2011, we will pursue the implementation of Egypt's peaceful nuclear programme by establishing our first nuclear plant for power generation. Egypt looks forward to

continued close cooperation with the IAEA in that area, given the Agency's growing role in support of sustainable development.

In commenting on the IAEA's report on its activities in 2012, I would like to highlight the following points. First, the Agency's technical cooperation activities are a priority for developing countries in terms of employing nuclear applications, including radioisotope, radiation and other technologies, in the areas of health, agriculture, food and water resources in order to promote progress towards development. Egypt calls for increased funding for technical cooperation activities, as well as equitable funding of all of the other activities of the IAEA. Technical cooperation is a key component of the work of the Agency pursuant to its statute.

Second, it is important to enhance international cooperation in strengthening national capacities in nuclear safety and emergency response to radiological and nuclear accidents. That would help to ensure easy access to safety information and equitable transfer of related technology. My delegation takes this opportunity to emphasize that the Agency should intensify efforts to assist member States in emergency preparedness and response to nuclear accidents by promoting technology transfer and capacity-building activities, including education and training in the field of crisis management.

Third, we stress that any rules or guidelines on nuclear security and safety must be developed and negotiated within a multilateral framework. Measures and initiatives aimed at strengthening nuclear security and safety should not be used as an excuse to restrict the inalienable right of developing countries to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, in accordance with the statute of the Agency.

Fourth, the role of the IAEA in verification and nuclear non-proliferation is closely related to its role in promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy in support of States' development programmes that fulfil their obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the statute of the IAEA.

Fifth, all countries of the Middle East except Israel have joined the IAEA comprehensive safeguards system. Israel remains the only country in the region with ambiguous nuclear activities that are not subject to international control and supervision. Israel continues to ignore the resolutions of the General Assembly and the General Conference of the IAEA urging it to accede to the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State and to subject all of its nuclear facilities to IAEA comprehensive safeguards. There is no doubt that this situation has increased the nuclear proliferation risk in the Middle East and continues to prevent the achievement of the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Sixth, Egypt stresses the importance of holding the 2012 conference on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, as agreed at the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT. Egypt also emphasizes the need for the conference to adopt a concrete and binding outcome with a view to achieving its objectives, as set forth at the 2010 Review Conference. Egypt looks forward to the contribution of the International Atomic Energy Agency to the 2012 conference and to receiving as soon as possible the background documentation that the IAEA has been mandated to prepare for the conference. Egypt notes its appreciation for the Agency's efforts in organizing a forum in November 2011 on the relevance of the experience gained through the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone to the Middle East.

Seventh, Egypt stresses that any retraction from the commitment to convene the conference on schedule this year, in accordance with the Final Document of the 2010 Review Conference (see NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)), will affect the effectiveness and benefit of verification activities in the Middle East. It will also affect the integrity of international efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation and the credibility of the NPT review process. It could even lead to the failure of the next Review Conference in 2015.

Eighth, Egypt reiterates the need to enable the International Atomic Energy Agency to carry out verification activities related to disarmament agreements, including those concerning the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, now and in the future. We look forward to the Agency's active role in that domain in the Middle East, through the implementation of its five-year Medium-Term Strategy for the period 2012-2017.

In conclusion, Egypt calls on all Member States to support the three pillars of the International Atomic Energy Agency — verification, nuclear safety and security, and peaceful uses of nuclear energy — in an integrated manner in order to contribute to fulfilling the purposes of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security and in achieving sustainable development.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We have carefully studied the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to the General Assembly (see A/67/152). Russia highly commends the work of the Agency aimed at improving and strengthening the global non-proliferation regime and at guaranteeing the widespread and safe use of nuclear energy.

The Agency is making a noteworthy contribution to resolving the issues of a secure energy supply, the fight against the global effects of climate change, and maintaining the health and well-being of people throughout the world. It is important that the Agency continue to formulate its efforts based on broader international cooperation in the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

In speaking of the Agency's activities, we cannot fail to note the unique nature of its verification mechanism, which enables the highly efficient tracking of States' implementation of their obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

We advocate improvement of the Agency's verification capacity, including through the adoption of the additional protocol to its comprehensive safeguards system as the universally accepted standard for States' implementation of their nuclear non-proliferation obligations. An unbiased approach to nuclear verification based on objective indicators is the most important element in supporting the legitimacy of the IAEA comprehensive safeguards system and the non-proliferation regime in general.

Russia is actively participating in the Agency's activities as a financial donor, including through its voluntary contributions to the International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles and the Nuclear Security Fund. We wholeheartedly support the efforts of the Agency in technical cooperation and the provision of appropriate assistance to developing States.

In the context of the large-scale development of nuclear energy, the Russian Federation attaches priority to establishing a new architecture for peaceful nuclear cooperation based on multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle; the guaranteed provision of services for the nuclear fuel cycle; and resolving problems of spent fuel and radioactive waste management. On the basis of those priorities, Russia has launched an initiative to develop a global nuclear energy infrastructure and create an international network of nuclear fuel cycle centres.

We note with satisfaction that while our initiative has been sorely needed, it is also truly capable of resolving the tasks necessary to guarantee the unhampered access of all NPT States parties to the benefits of the peaceful use of nuclear energy, provided that they faithfully comply with their non-proliferation obligations.

In practice, however, it has afforded States the ability to enjoy the advantages of nuclear energy and to guarantee their nuclear fuel needs without introducing elements to the nuclear fuel cycle that are expensive and unsound from the standpoint of nuclear proliferation.

In the context of that initiative, together with Kazakhstan, Ukraine and Armenia, we have launched on Russian territory an international uranium enrichment centre, to which we invite all States working to develop nuclear power in compliance with their non-proliferation obligations.

Another important step in establishing the global nuclear energy infrastructure was the creation in Russia of a shared supply of low-enriched uranium administered by IAEA. It has already been fully established, and States members of the Agency that are in compliance with their non-proliferation obligations are eligible to enjoy that resource.

We are convinced that lessons must be drawn from the outcome of the accident at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant in order to prevent such a recurrence in future. The central role in that endeavour must belong to the Agency as the only international organization with the requisite expertise and authority. One of the key lessons of the Fukushima accident is that the international community needs to perfect the international legal framework and the technological and organizational aspects of nuclear safety.

Based on that understanding, Russia has proposed important initiatives to fill the existing gaps in relevant international legal documents and instruments. In that context, we note additions to the Convention on Nuclear Safety and the Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident. Moreover, Russia has made proposals to improve the Agency's safety standards and anticipates that these initiatives will enjoy broad support and come to fruition.

An extremely important task remains to establish a due level of protection of all nuclear facilities and materials in order to prevent possible perpetration of acts of nuclear terrorism by non-State actors. In the interest of strengthening nuclear physical security, Russia was a sponsor of Security Council resolution 1540 (2004). Together with the United States, in 2006 it introduced the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism. The Initiative is now supported by 85 States and serves as an effective instrument of cooperation in the sharing of extensive experience and practical measures aimed at countering the threat of nuclear terrorism.

Russia has signed and ratified the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism and the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and Nuclear Facilities, as well as its amendment. We call on the States that have not yet done so to expedite completion of their domestic procedures in order to accede to those most important international instruments.

We are convinced that the Agency must play the central role in coordinating States' efforts to guarantee nuclear security. We support the implementation of the Agency's programme on that issue for 2010-2013 and its proposal to convene an international conference on nuclear security issues in 2013.

Russia positively commends the practical contribution of the Agency to the multilateral quest for ways to resolve regional proliferation challenges. We commend the endeavours of the Agency in using its expert potential to ensure the sustainable functioning of the nuclear non-proliferation regime.

We support draft resolution A/67/L.3 on the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency. As a sponsor of the draft resolution, Russia wholeheartedly endorses the work of the Agency in the interest of strengthening and ensuring the nuclear non-proliferation regime and achieving reliable energy supplies.

Mr. Kellerman (South Africa): First of all, my delegation thanks the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and his staff for the comprehensive overview of IAEA activities contained in the Agency's annual report (see A/67/152). We appreciate the valuable contribution of the Agency in supporting developing countries' use of nuclear science and technology to address national development needs.

The Agency's support in areas such as food and agriculture, human health, water resource management and the environment is essential to the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals. Furthermore, my delegation welcomes the publication of training packages for medical physicists in the area of diagnostic radiology and nuclear medicine. South Africa continues to host fellows and scientific visitors to assist capacity-building in nuclear medicine.

My country also welcomes the Africa pilot project of the Virtual University and Regional Training Network for Cancer Control, which entered its second year in 2011. The project is both a vehicle and a facilitating mechanism to enhance cancer control, e-learning, education and training in Africa, and South Africa looks forward to participating in the initiative, which will pave the way for subregional cancer control workforce training hubs.

Global security of energy supply has become one of the key focus areas worldwide, mainly because of decreasing natural resources, global warming, climate change, pollution and rapid global growth. South Africa's nuclear energy policy is driven by the imperative of ensuring the security of its energy supply and reducing its carbon footprint, and by the beneficiation of our strategic mineral resources for the economic development of our country.

In that regard, my Government approved the Integrated Resource Plan 2010-2030, which incorporates a significant expansion of nuclear power by the year 2030. The Cabinet has also established the National Nuclear Energy Executive Coordination Committee, an executive body comprised of ministers who have a direct role to play in the nuclear energy programme. In preparation for its nuclear build programme, South Africa has adopted the IAEA milestones approach, which addresses many critical elements necessary for successful implementation.

South Africa is working closely with the Agency, and has requested an Integrated Nuclear Infrastructure Review Mission in the country. In that context, the South African Minister of Energy recently announced South Africa's intention to invite the IAEA to conduct an external assessment of its readiness and to identify any possible risks that may need attention in order to ensure a successful nuclear build programme.

Regarding nuclear safety, South Africa is pleased to note that the level of nuclear safety among the

435 nuclear power plants in operation around the world remains high. My delegation takes note of the activities undertaken by the Agency to increase nuclear safety as detailed in the Director General's report on the IAEA Action Plan on Nuclear Safety.

In conclusion, South Africa attaches great importance to the Agency's Technical Cooperation Programme. We welcome the support rendered through a range of regional and national projects to address socioeconomic development needs of Member States, especially African countries. In that regard, we also value the continuous support of the Agency through the activities of the African Regional Cooperative Agreement for Research, Development and Training related to Nuclear Science and Technology — in Africa and in the region.

Mr. Khazaee (Islamic Republic of Iran): Nuclear science is among the greatest achievements of humankind and should therefore be used to serve its well-being. Given the numerous peaceful applications of nuclear technology as a cost-effective, environmentally friendly and climatically benign source of energy, it has gained a prominent position in the economic life and advancement of nations. Without a doubt, demand for the development and use of nuclear energy and technology will continue to grow in future.

The Islamic Republic of Iran considers the inalienable right to develop research, production and uses of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination — including the right of every State party to develop for peaceful purposes a full national nuclear fuel cycle — to be the very foundation and one of the most important pillars of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). While attaching great importance to the full, effective, balanced, simultaneous, non-selective and non-discriminatory implementation of all provisions of the NPT, we strongly stress that the exercise of the inalienable right to pursue nuclear science, energy and technology for peaceful purposes, which is an inherent part of the sovereignty of States parties, can never be suspended or restricted by any organ, under any circumstances or pretexts whatsoever.

According to article IV of the NPT, not only shall nothing in the Treaty be interpreted as affecting that inalienable right, but all parties have a firm legal obligation

> "to facilitate, and have the right to participate in, the fullest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy".

Furthermore, in that context, we underline the importance of article III of the NPT, according to which even the required safeguards

> "shall be implemented in a manner designed to comply with article IV of this Treaty, and to avoid hampering the economic or technological development of the Parties or international cooperation in the field of peaceful nuclear activities, including the international exchange of nuclear material and equipment for the processing, use or production of nuclear material for peaceful purposes".

My delegation also would like to emphasize that, according to articles II and III of the IAEA statute,

> "[t]he Agency shall seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world...; [t]o encourage and assist research on, and development and practical application of, atomic energy for peaceful uses throughout the world; and, if requested to do so, to act as an intermediary for the purposes of securing the performance of services or the supplying of materials, equipment, or facilities by one member of the Agency for another...; to perform any operation or service useful in research on, or development or practical application of, atomic energy for peaceful purposes; [and t]o foster the exchange of scientific and technical information on peaceful uses of atomic energy".

Accordingly, we underline the Agency's primary responsibility to assist member States and the importance of its other statutory functions. In that connection, we stress the need for strict observance by the IAEA of the principles of impartiality and professionalism; along with the States members of the Non-Aligned Movement, "strongly reject attempts by any State to politicize the work of the IAEA, including its Technical Cooperation Programme"; and call for an end to any interference in the Agency's activities, especially its verification process, as such acts could jeopardize the authority, efficiency and credibility of the IAEA and endanger the credibility of the NPT and the inalienable right of its parties to develop research,

production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.

Unfortunately, the application of a discriminatory, selective, highly restrictive and politically motivated approach to nuclear cooperation by developed States parties to the NPT, the main suppliers of nuclear high technology, has given rise to the impression that being a party to the NPT is not a privilege, because rather than facilitating nuclear cooperation, it impedes it. In that connection, it is a source of grave concern that those who have chosen not to accede to the NPT not only are not subject to any pressure to do so, but are also encouraged and generously rewarded in different ways.

A living example is the well-documented assistance and cooperation provided by certain Western countries — in particular, the United States and the two nuclear-weapon States members of the European Union, the United Kingdom and France — to the Israeli regime, which, in addition to having an unsafeguarded nuclear programme, possesses one of the world's largest stockpiles of nuclear weapons. Such measures, of course, run counter to the letter and spirit of the NPT and, accordingly, are clear cases of non-compliance with the explicit legal obligations under the Treaty. Undoubtedly, those policies severely undermine the universality, relevance, integrity and credibility of the NPT. We did not see any reference to that point by the Director General of the IAEA in his statement distributed today.

The Islamic Republic of Iran, while being extremely proud that it is exercising its inalienable right to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, is also fully committed to its legal obligations, and its nuclear activities are and have always been exclusively for peaceful purposes. Despite all external political pressures on the IAEA, it has repeatedly concluded that "declared nuclear material in Iran remain[s] in peaceful activities". In that regard, it is worth noting that that is exactly the same conclusion that the IAEA secretariat has come to for 51 States with additional protocols in force, as well as for 61 States without additional protocols in force.

Finally, with regard to the so-called alleged studies on Iran's nuclear programme referred to in the IAEA report, I would like to point out that they are forged reports and include graphs that are not credible, which is why the Agency is not allowed to make them available to the Islamic Republic of Iran. As always, most of that information has been provided by the Israeli regime and its big ally. One may easily conclude that such information is as credible as the childish cartoon that was drawn here in this Hall in September by the Zionist regime's Prime Minister.

Mrs. Cizare (Ethiopia): First of all, I would like to thank Ambassador Yukiya Amano, Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), for his annual report on the work of the Agency (see A/67/152). I also wish to express our support for the draft resolution before us (A/67/L.3).

Ethiopia firmly believes that the work of the IAEA in general, and specifically its annual activities as described in the report, are of paramount importance to ensuring the maintenance of international peace and security. We also acknowledge the Agency's growing role in ensuring that nuclear science and technology are used only for peaceful purposes, as well as its technical cooperation in bringing about tangible progress in national efforts to reduce poverty and achieve the Millennium Development Goals.

Ethiopia is one of the beneficiary States of the IAEA's activities under the Agency's Technical Cooperation Programme. The Agency's support has been instrumental in helping us develop modest capabilities in the control of tsetse flies, the treatment of cancer, diagnostic nuclear medicine services, isotope hydrological analysis and non-destructive quality testing. Despite that encouraging cooperation, I would like to underline that we are still far from the optimal use of the transferred technologies or from sustaining the services initiated through the various technical cooperation projects that have been implemented in the past several years.

Our major technical cooperation project with the Agency is aimed at eradicating the tsetse fly from the southern Rift Valley region of Ethiopia through an integrated pest-management approach. The project is currently being implemented, and, so far, remarkable achievements have been registered and quite a substantial number of communities have benefited by regaining their farmland and seeing the return of health to their livestock. The project has been and will continue to be the top priority in our technical cooperation with the IAEA. In that regard, we wish to request that the Agency continue to accord high priority to agricultural and livestock development in Africa, including in Ethiopia. My country reaffirms its strong commitment to peaceful nuclear applications as an important component of the effort to tackle the

challenges of development. In that regard, the support of the IAEA in ensuring food safety and security, as well as energy, through nuclear technology should be maintained and strengthened.

The other important area of partnership where Ethiopia continues to benefit from the IAEA Technical Cooperation Programme is the application of nuclear technology and techniques in the area of human health. In response to the rise in the number of cases of cancer in developing countries, Ethiopia has come increasingly to rely on the IAEA's comprehensive Programme of Action for Cancer Therapy. In that respect, while expressing appreciation to the Agency for its technical assistance and for the impact assessment made, Ethiopia hopes to see a further strengthening of our partnership with the Agency. The annual incidence of cancer is estimated to be about 150,000 cases, of which 80 per cent will require radiotherapy. It is for that compelling reason that we call upon the Agency to further strengthen its support to Ethiopia and other developing countries in the fight against cancer through sustainable cancer therapy programmes by carrying out more integrated national and regional programmes.

In conclusion, as one of the founding States members of the Agency, Ethiopia reiterates its strong commitment to the peaceful use of nuclear technologies and to respecting and implementing global and regional instruments designed to control radioactive and other nuclear materials. However, we are also fully aware that the threats of nuclear weapons to international peace and security are real and need to be confronted with collective and concerted efforts. Ethiopia will continue to support the IAEA's activities to effectively execute its global mandate of ensuring the peaceful use of nuclear science and technology for the benefit of humankind.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): We thank Director General Amano for presenting the annual report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and congratulate Fiji, San Marino and Trinidad and Tobago on becoming the newest members of the Agency.

For over five decades, the IAEA has worked successfully as a catalyst for promoting nuclear science and related technologies. It has helped member States advance their development priorities, while ensuring that nuclear science and technology are used in a safe, secure and sustainable manner. For that, the Agency deserves the deep appreciation of us all.

We share the Agency's assessment that nuclear energy should continue to be a preferred source of viable, safe and sustainable alternative energy in the future, despite the justifiable public anxiety that arose in the wake of the Fukushima accident.

Pakistan recognizes the important role played by IAEA verification regime. We have fully complied with our obligations pursuant to our Safeguards Agreements with the IAEA. The unanimous approval last year by the IAEA Board of our C.3 and C.4 Safeguards Agreements reflected the international community's recognition of Pakistan's expertise in the safe and secure operation of nuclear power plants.

Pakistan believes that all States should fully comply with their safeguards obligations and international commitments in order to maintain the credibility of the safeguards regime. Maintaining a balance between the regulatory, promotional and safety functions of the Agency is essential. The Agency must be seen by all member States as an impartial, efficient and professional body. It is important to correct the public perception of the IAEA as being only a watchdog. Its primary role in the promotion of peaceful uses of nuclear science and technology needs to be re-emphasized.

Pakistan is a strong advocate of utilizing nuclear technology for peace, progress and prosperity for all. As Pakistan is the sixth most populous nation in the world, socioeconomic development is a priority for our Government. For over 55 years now, the Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission has been actively engaged in harnessing nuclear technology for our development priorities. In the past five decades, Pakistan has sought to enhance the application of nuclear technology for our people in a variety of ways and in collaboration with the Agency.

Even as we utilize nuclear technology for diverse purposes, the harnessing of nuclear science for power generation remains a priority. At present, the share of nuclear power in Pakistan's electricity mix is modest. However, in view of our large population, the deficit in fossil fuels and rising energy demand, we plan to increase the current level of 750 megawatts of nuclear power-generation capacity to at least 8,800 megawatts by the year 2030. That is a challenging task, but we are determined to pursue it as an important development imperative.

Three nuclear power plants are already on line and have been performing very well. The oldest of these

was commissioned way back in 1972. Besides those three, two more nuclear power plants, generating 340 megawatts each, are under construction and are expected to be commissioned by 2016. All nuclear power plants in Pakistan operate under IAEA safeguards.

Pakistan has also been actively engaged in drawing lessons from the events at Fukushima. As a result of stress tests and extensive studies, a response action plan has been developed in collaboration with the Pakistan Nuclear Regulatory Authority (PNRA). The plan is at various stages of implementation under PNRA oversight. Pakistan has always attached great importance to ensuring that all its work in the nuclear power domain is conducted within secure and transparent institutional structures. At the national level, the Pakistan Nuclear Regulatory Authority, which is an independent regulatory and licensing body, has been performing professionally and efficiently for 11 years now. At the international level, we have had a long-standing engagement with IAEA forums. We have invited and supported World Association of Nuclear Operators peer review missions. We have also welcomed individual experts under the aegis of the IAEA.

It is a matter of growing concern that even the supply of safety-related equipment has fallen victim to the restrictive and discriminatory export-control policies of some States. That does not augur well for the IAEA's goal of encouraging worldwide enhancement of safety standards.

Nuclear security is both a global challenge and a national responsibility. Pakistan accords the highest priority to ensuring the establishment of robust security mechanisms. Over the years, we have put in place extensive physical protection measures, robust command-and-control structures, comprehensive export controls and wide-ranging regulatory regimes. In cooperation with the IAEA, Pakistan is implementing a nuclear security action plan that has been called a model for other States. We have gained considerable experience in the field of nuclear security. A national training academy runs multi-tier training modules for comprehensive nuclear security solutions, and is being opened for international training courses as well. A nuclear emergency management system is being put in place. Pakistan subscribes to the IAEA's Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources, and to its Illicit Trafficking Database. Where the security of radioactive sources is concerned, Pakistan is implementing a cradle-to-grave concept, in accordance with IAEA nuclear security series documents.

Finally, the IAEA can make a significant contribution to increasing the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world. The Agency is uniquely placed to meet the needs and challenges of the twenty-first century in a balanced manner. Pakistan believes in an equitable, non-discriminatory and criteria-based approach to advance the universally shared goals of non-proliferation and promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. We hope that safety and security considerations will facilitate, not hinder, the pursuit of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for promoting the development agenda and offsetting environmental degradation.

Mr. Shin Dong Ik (Republic of Korea): At the outset, my delegation would like to thank Mr. Yukiya Amano, Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), for transmitting the IAEA's annual report for 2011 (see A/67/152) and for providing additional information on the Agency's more recent developments and activities in his prepared statement (see A/67/152/Add.1). We appreciate the competent and professional manner in which the Director General and the Secretariat have steered the Agency through its extensive activities with a view to accelerating and expanding the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world. We note with particular appreciation that, in carrying out its mandate, the Agency has risen to meet an array of challenges, ranging from the risks of nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism, to nuclear safety in the wake of the Fukushima accident last year.

In that context, my delegation would like to commend the Agency for its achievements in the field of nuclear safety. As outlined in the report, the Agency has been successful in implementing the Action Plan on Nuclear Safety adopted at the fifty-fifth session of the IAEA's General Conference, held last year. Through implementation of the Action Plan with the full cooperation and participation of member States, the Agency is successfully incorporating the lessons learned from Fukushima, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of both the regulatory framework and the operating organizations in IAEA member States. We also note with satisfaction that the Agency has taken steps to upgrade its emergency preparedness and response capabilities as a whole, which we anticipate

will result in tangible improvements to national emergency preparedness and response arrangements.

The work of the IAEA in the field of nuclear security, particularly its efforts to coordinate and enhance cooperation among various initiatives and activities, is also worthy of note. We welcome the progress that the Agency has made in implementing the goals and priorities set out in its *Nuclear Security Report 2011*. We are also pleased to note the successful establishment of the Nuclear Security Guidance Committee as a standing body of experts on nuclear security.

The Republic of Korea hosted the second Nuclear Security Summit last March in Seoul. The Seoul Summit resulted in comprehensive agreed measures for action to prevent nuclear and radiological terrorism, including eliminating and reducing nuclear materials; encouraging wider adherence to international instruments; and combating the illicit trafficking of nuclear and radiological materials. In addition, the Seoul Summit emphasized the central role that the IAEA plays in strengthening the international nuclear security framework. In that regard, we welcome and support the IAEA International Conference on Nuclear Security, to be held in Vienna in July 2013. My delegation is convinced that the Conference will provide a timely global forum to discuss future directions and priorities for nuclear security, as well as generate valuable input for the preparation of the 2014-2017 Nuclear Security Plan.

In early September, the Director General released an updated report on the application of safeguards in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. As the Director General stated in his report, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's nuclear programme is a matter of serious concern, and its statements about uranium enrichment activities and the construction of a light-water reactor continue to be deeply troubling. Sharing as we do the Director General's serious concern, my delegation would like to point out that those activities are a clear breach of Security Council resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1874 (2009). My delegation therefore urges the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to comply fully with its obligations under the relevant resolutions of the Council.

Furthermore, we would like to recall the resolution on the implementation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) Safeguards Agreement between the Agency and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, adopted by consensus at the fifty-sixth session of the General Conference, held this year. We also reiterate the international community's call for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to come into full compliance with the NPT and to cooperate promptly with the Agency in the full and effective implementation of comprehensive safeguards. The resolution voices the international community's serious concern about the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's nuclear programme, including its construction of a light-water reactor and its uranium enrichment activities. The resolution also reaffirms the consensus that exists in the international community that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should not have nuclear-weapon-State status. It also underlines concern about the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's statement in August announcing its intention to totally re-examine its nuclear policy. As the resolution clearly states, whatever that review may consist of, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea must reaffirm its commitment to denuclearization and to the 2005 Joint Statement of the Six-Party Talks.

With regard to the Agency's activities in the field of safeguards, we welcome the continuing increase in the number of countries for which both a comprehensive safeguards agreement and an additional protocol are in force. With a total of 114 States now having additional protocols in force — an increase of 10 since the last report — the additional protocol is well on its way to becoming the universal international safeguards standard.

We strongly believe that the additional protocol constitutes a crucial verification instrument that not only enhances the Agency's ability to verify the peaceful nature of all nuclear material in a State but also ensures international confidence in a State's nuclear programme. In that regard, we call for other member States to conclude and bring into force the comprehensive safeguards agreement and the additional protocol if they have not yet done so.

In the light of the full support for the IAEA's work to achieve our common goal of harnessing nuclear energy in the service of peace and development for humankind, the Republic of Korea is pleased to co-sponsor draft resolution A/67/L.3 on the report of the IAEA.

Mr. Tarbah (Libya) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, we would like to congratulate Mr. Yukiya Amano, Director General of the International Atomic Energy

Agency (IAEA), for the valuable and comprehensive report on the activities of the Agency (see A/67/152). The report reflects the sincere efforts made to achieve the international goals set by the international community, foremost of which are non-proliferation, the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, the use of nuclear energy for sustainable development and the advancement of scientific knowledge for the good of all humankind in all areas. We would like to stress the following points.

First, we emphasize the importance and central role of the IAEA in the areas of inspection and verification, as well as in providing technical assistance to developing countries in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Secondly, we stress the inalienable right of all States to acquire and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, as well as the need to avoid a monopoly on nuclear technology by some States while depriving others from acquiring it. Thirdly, we underline the need for all member States to commit without exception to opening their nuclear facilities to IAEA inspection and verification. Fourthly, the international community should bring pressure to bear on Israel to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to open its nuclear facilities to the international inspection and verification regime of the Agency.

In closing, we would like to stress that Libya is eager to promote and support a cooperative partnership with the IAEA in a transparent manner. We are willing to provide all assistance necessary to IAEA inspectors to fulfil their functions in Libya as appropriate.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item.

We shall now proceed to consider draft resolution A/67/L.3. Before giving the floor to speakers in explanation of vote or position, may I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Ri Tong Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): Regarding the report under discussion (see A/67/152) and the related draft resolution (A/67/L.3), my country's delegation considers the report to be far from correct or true and believes that it fails to cover the fundamental reality of the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula. With regard to that matter, my country's delegation would like to clarify its position.

First of all, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) is without justification and has no power to intervene on the nuclear issue of the Korea peninsula. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is not a State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons or a member of the IAEA. As far as our relationship with the IAEA is concerned, already in the early 1990s the Democratic People's Republic of Korea cut off its official relations with the Agency and severed all contacts of any kind with it. We made that decision when the Agency lost the impartiality expected of an international organization by adopting the wrongful and biased attitude implicit in siding with the politically motivated conspiracy of the United States against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

However, at a later stage, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States entered into bilateral talks and the Six-Party Talks were opened, at which point the United States requested that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea allow the IAEA to offer technical consultation on the sidelines of the Six-Party Talks. We reluctantly honoured that request. The condition for that allowance was that the consultation would take place only while the Six-Party Talks were in progress.

Nevertheless, considering the current situation and developments on the Korean peninsula, the United States has not hesitated to escalate, aggravate and ramp up its threats and attempts at blackmail through increased hostilities towards the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The situation on the peninsula is on the brink of explosion. Nobody knows when war may break out.

In those circumstances, the Six-Party Talks have come nearly to the point of being a dead letter. In that state of affairs, the IAEA has no role to play. Furthermore, the IAEA has sided with the hostile United States against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, blindly following the United States policy against my country. It has complicated the way towards a peaceful resolution of the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula. We can therefore say that the IAEA has no justifiable role to play.

Despite all of the foregoing, we now have this year's annual report before us. The IAEA has come out and produced such language as "deeply troubling" with regard to the new enrichment facilities and light-water reactor construction, while also expressing the

Agency's so-called readiness to resume its involvement in verification activities.

All of that is absurd and makes no sense in the context of what I have just said.

On this occasion, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would like to draw the attention of all participants here to the different status of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea, as everybody knows, has emerged as a full-fledged and justifiable nuclear-weapon State. It is clear that the IAEA cannot and should not use the same standard it was using when the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's nuclear activities were limited to peaceful purposes. The function of the IAEA is to deal mainly with non-nuclear-weapon States and the case of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is different, as clearly observed in the IAEA's previous approach. The Agency has never raised an issue or expressed concern about the nuclear activities of the other nuclear-weapon States; it has done so only with regard to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. That does not make sense; it is absurd and yet another instance of the Agency's diminishing impartiality in its activities.

Secondly, the IAEA cannot and is not in a position to offer a helping hand in the settlement of the nuclear issue of the Korean peninsula. The resolution of all such issues should be based on an objective analysis of the fundamental current reality behind those issues. With regard to the fundamental essence of the nuclear issue of the Korean peninsula, it is absolutely the product of the hostile, deeply rooted and long-standing policy of the United States against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Moreover, the United States did not hesitate to list the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as part of the axis of evil and as a first nuclear pre-emptive strike target by the United States.

Furthermore, when one considers the United States military activities in South Korea this year, its holding of one large-scale exercise after another, involving up to 500,000 troops, is unprecedented. The United States is more than ready to attack the Democratic People's Republic of Korea at any time. Another joint military exercise is now under way, involving over 200,000 troops of the United States and South Korea. As representatives can imagine, they are using live ammunition. In an exercise this summer, they used the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's flag as a target on the ground for an air strike exercise involving live ammunition. It is clear that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a target to be eliminated by the United States.

In the face of that threat and in response to such blackmail from the largest nuclear-weapon State, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had no option but to go nuclear to defend itself, to safeguard its security and sovereignty and to safeguard the right to existence of the entire Korean nation. Therefore, the nuclear deterrent of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea represents the deterrence of war and it is an almighty and most treasured sword that can guarantee peace, stability and security on the Korean peninsula and in the region. It is therefore in the interests of the regional countries to move towards peace, development, détente and stability.

Concerning the withdrawal of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from the NPT and the IAEA, our objective is to make the United States abandon its strong-arm policy and move towards reconciliation and coexistence with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. As long as that hostile policy continues, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will increase, strengthen and expand its nuclear capability and its arsenal of nuclear weapons. Therefore, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would like to kindly recommend that the International Atomic Energy Agency not repeat its issuance of this kind of annual report, with its absurd content and language. It will result only in tarnishing and destroying its own image.

The Acting President: We have heard the only speaker in explanation of position.

The Assembly will now take action on draft resolution A/67/L.3, entitled "Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency". I give the floor to the representative of the Secretariat.

Mr. Botnaru (Department for General Assembly and Conference Management): I should like to announce that, since the submission of the draft resolution, in addition to those delegations listed in document A/67/L.3, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq,

Ireland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Zambia.

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/67/L.3. May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/67/L.3 was adopted (resolution 67/3).

The Acting President: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply. May I remind members that statements in the exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second intervention, and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Ri Tong Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): Concerning the remarks made by the representatives of Japan and South Korea, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would like to exercise its right of reply.

First, concerning the statement made by the representative of Japan that the nuclear weapons of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are a threat to East Asia, we totally reject this allegation, as it makes no sense at all in the context of the fundamental reality of the Korean peninsula for the reasons I have just elaborated upon. But one thing is clear. When we consider who is the source of the threat in the region, it is none other than Japan. Japan has nuclear capabilities. It has over 40 tons of plutonium. It is a plutonium world champion. It is acknowledged that Japan can assemble nuclear weapons at short notice, even within only a few hours' time.

Japan has a secret nuclear agreement with the United States, adopted in 1960, under which it allows nuclear-weapon-capable American warships to enter its territorial waters at any time. Japan continues to tell the world that it has three non-nuclear principles, which are not legalized but are only oral. In reality, it is doing something quite different; it is moving towards militarism without expressing any apology for its past crimes, including crimes against humanity, of which we are all aware.

Concerning the remarks made by the representative of South Korea, again, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea cannot have the status of nuclear-weapon State. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea has never requested such status. It is up to us whether we do so or not; it is our right in response to the threat. And South Korea has allowed American nuclear weapons into South Korea since 1957, blackmailing the entire Korean nation. They cannot hide or cast aside this fact. Moreover, South Korea is still under the nuclear umbrella of the United States.

Mr. Kodama (Japan): I would like to exercise my right of reply in response to the statement just made by the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

First, the Government of Japan's adherence to the three non-nuclear principles — not possessing, manufacturing or permitting the introduction of nuclear weapons into our territory — remains unchanged, and Japan's determination in pursuit of the total elimination of nuclear weapons with a view to achieving a world without nuclear weapons is unshakable.

Secondly, Japan maintains an exclusively defence-oriented policy, and therefore exercises conducted by the Self-Defence Forces of Japan do not target any particular country or area. Moreover, the ballistic missile defence system that Japan has decide to introduce is purely defensive and does not threaten any country or area surrounding Japan.

Thirdly, it is not a fact that the Government of Japan has ever allowed the introduction of nuclear weapons by the United States onto Japanese territory. Based on the United States nuclear policy expressed to date, including the 1991 announcement, it is the judgement of the Japanese Government that there is currently no introduction of nuclear weapons by the United States, including via vessels and/or aircraft calling at port in, landing on or transiting Japanese territories. I reiterate that the Japan continues to maintain the policy of adhering to the three non-nuclear principles.

Lastly, Japan has acted in strict compliance with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and its International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards obligations as an NPT State party. Japan's

peaceful uses of nuclear energy have been confirmed by the IAEA in its annual conclusions that all nuclear materials remain in peaceful activities. Moreover, beyond legal obligations, as a measure of international transparency Japan has regularly reported the amount of its plutonium holdings in accordance with the guidelines for the management of plutonium, most recently on 17 September.

Mr. Ri Tong Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): Concerning the remarks made by the representative of Japan, once again the Democratic People's Republic of Korea totally rejects this allegation. All that has been said is simply political cover-up. It is a fact that in 1960 Japan concluded a secret nuclear agreement with the United States that goes against the three non-nuclear principles, which are themselves contained in no legal or legitimate document. If Japan is serious about its non-nuclear position, then why should it hesitate to adopt a legitimate document?

Lastly, Japan is pursuing militarization, seeking to become a military Power. It is creating territorial disputes with all neighbouring countries, including on the Korean peninsula, China and Russia. Japan is making territorial claims that are utterly unfounded and aimed purely at promoting the expansionist and militaristic interests of Japan.

Mr. Kodama (Japan): I have no intention of repeating the statement I made earlier to refute the allegations made by the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. With respect to other groundless allegations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea delegation against Japan, I would rather my delegation reserve its right of reply until an appropriate opportunity arrives in due course.

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 85?

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.